DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 143 438 PS 009 463

AUTHOR	Asano, Mildred M.
TITLE	A Description of the Structure, Functions, and Services of the Title IV-A Social Services Component in Philadelphia, 1974-1975. Report No. 7660.
INSTITUTION	Philadelphia School District, Pa. Office of Research and Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Oct 75
NOTE	187p.; For related documents, see PS 009 464-467
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$10.03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Admission Criteria; *Community Surveys; *Day Care Services; Early Childhood Education; Evaluation; Field Interviews; Field Studies; *Program Descriptions; Referral; *Social Agencies; *Social Services; *Social Workers; Staff Improvement; Staff Role
IDENTIFIERS	Pennsylvania (Philadelphia)

ABSTRACT

This report, representing the second half of a comprehensive study, presents descriptive data on the structure, functions, and services of the Social Services Component in Title IV-A Day Care in Philadelphia. Data were based on extensive interviews with 67 respondents representing 35 agencies. Two interviews, one each with a supervisor and a social service worker, were planned for each social service unit so that a more comprehensive and reliable description could be obtained. The actual data collected represented two-person responses from 27 units, and single responses from 13 units. Major areas in which findings are presented include: (1) simplicity of component structure, (2) activities of service workers, (3) key services offered, (4) procedures for admission of children into the Day Care Program, (5) agency provision for the professional growth and development of its workers, (6) case work load, (7) service worker participation in parent involvement activities, and (8) service worker role in the referral of clients to other community agencies. Two major problems identified by respondents were that the service worker's role needed additional clarification and that there was a lack of support from other internal staff members. Analysis of within-unit data suggested that there was a lack of communication among workers and supervisors in the same units. Extensive tables are included. (Author/JMB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED143438

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A DESCRIPTION OF THE STRUCTURE, FUNCTIONS, AND SERVICES OF THE TITLE IV-A SOCIAL SERVICES COMPONENT IN PHILADELPHIA 1974-1975

Prepared By
Mildred M. Asano
Research Assistant

Rachel M. Hill
Director
Day Care Services

Thomas C. McNamara
Manager
Early Childhood Evaluation

Milton Goldberg
Executive Director
Early Childhood Programs

Irvin J. Farber
Assistant Director
Priority Operations
Evaluation Services

October, 1975
Report #7660

Michael H. Kean
Executive Director

Office of Research and Evaluation
THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

PS 009463

ABSTRACT

In 1974-1975 the Day Care Evaluation Unit undertook a comprehensive descriptive study of the Social Services Component in Title IV-A Day Care in Philadelphia. The first objective of this comprehensive study was addressed in the report entitled "A Profile of Social Services Personnel in Title IV-A Day Care in Philadelphia, 1974-1975." This second and final report was concerned with the second major objective of the overall study which called for a description of the structure, functions and services of the component.

Data for the report were based on extensive interviews with 67 respondents representing 35 agencies. Two interviews, one each with a "supervisor" and a social service worker, were planned for each social service unit so that a more comprehensive and reliable description could be obtained. The actual data collected represented two-person responses from 24 units, and single responses from 11 units.

The major findings of the report are as follows:

The structure of the component was "simple," as the component was usually staffed by only one social service worker, and in more than half of the cases, this individual reported directly to the director of the agency, center, or program who may or may not have had social casework experience. The functions of the service worker were numerous, and included intake procedures, explaining services, recruiting parents for parent activities, enforcing policies, organizing meetings, and advocating for the families. Key services included information, referral, and counseling, and were focused upon problems with health, child rearing, and marriage.

The typical admission procedure was examined in terms of characteristic intake procedures and the priority for selection. Intake was usually accomplished in one meeting of the social worker and the parent. Information was collected concerning family background and child's health and developmental history. Information given (verbally) to parents concerned explanations of program, services, and policies. If families were eligible under the State guidelines, and if only one family could be selected for admission, the priorities were "date of application" and "child with multiple psychological problems." Most social service workers had the authority to admit families but not to terminate services. The internal criteria for terminating services were "excessive absences," "chronic illness or severe disablement of child," and "lack of parent cooperation." In half of the social service units, if a family was determined "not eligible," the worker would inquire into the family's desire to appeal the decision. An appeal had been processed, however, in only one of every seven units during the last year. Further, social service workers generally referred ineligible families to other community social agencies (non-Title IV-A).

The agency typically provided for professional growth and development of its social service workers through release time with pay so that they could attend internal or external staff development programs (Day Care Services). Half the agencies provided internal programs (many of which were focused on working with parents). Most agencies also provided an initial orientation for new social service workers.

The criterion for determining workload was usually a straight forward even distribution of families among workers without regard for any other consideration; in most units then, since there was only one worker, "she" had all families.

Most service workers participate in parent involvement activities and provide additional direct services to six of every ten families. The special needs of families were seen as those related to physical health, child rearing and child guidance, and marital/separation/divorce problems. These needs were met through information giving, referral, and counseling. The workers seemed to provide a unique link between the agency, community resources and the family.

A central file of community agencies was available (although it was not clear who was to maintain it). If families did not follow through with a referral, the social service worker would make two additional efforts to get the family to the agency. Fifty percent of all referrals were to health related agencies.

Two major problems identified by respondents were that the service worker's role needed additional clarification, and that there was a lack of support from other internal staff members.

For one of every three questions, more than 20% of each pair of respondents from the same unit did not give the same answer. It was concluded that there was a lack of communication among workers and supervisors in the same units. The perceptions of the respondents, however, were generally in agreement with the guidelines.

A Description of the Structure, Functions, and Services of the Title IV-A Social Services Component in Philadelphia 1974-1975

Introduction

This is the second of two reports based on a comprehensive descriptive study of the Social Services Component in Title IV-A Day Care agencies in Philadelphia during 1974-1975.

The two major objectives for the overall study were:

1. To describe the personnel employed in the social services component.
2. To describe the depth and scope of the social services component: that is, the kinds of services provided in day care agencies.

The first report "A Profile of Social Services Personnel in Title IV-A in Philadelphia, 1974-1975" was prepared to satisfy objective 1. This second report provides the response to objective 2 and is concerned with the following specific questions:

1. What is the typical admission procedure, i.e., who is involved and what information is shared between the family and agency?
2. When a child/family is ineligible for day care, what actions are taken by the agency?
3. What are the priorities adopted by each agency for admission of a child?
4. How does the component provide professional growth and development for social service staff?
5. What are the criteria for determining the workloads of the staff?

A 12 page interview schedule was developed by the Day Care Services Evaluation Unit to collect data for the report. The schedule was divided

into four parts: Part A focused on Staffing and Training, Part B focused on Services, the Service Plan and Service Needs, Part C focused on Intake, Admission and Termination, and Part D focused on Referral and Follow-up. (See Appendix A)

Data Collection and Analysis

This second stage of the comprehensive study was undertaken from July 31 to August 29, 1975. Initially 39 agencies were included in the study; however, two had to be discarded immediately on the basis that one agency closed permanently and one closed during the month of August. As a result, the 37 agencies that were operating during August, 1975 were the only available sources for data collection for this report.

The data were collected through personal interviews; the number of interviews were to be double the number of social service units. The unit was defined simply as the social services component, for small agencies, and as a group of social service workers (not to exceed 7) who were supervised by one person, for larger agencies. This procedure for weighting by size permitted a more accurate picture of existing practices. For each unit, two respondents were selected. One respondent was the social service supervisor (or in situations where this title position was non-existent, the person supervising the social worker or aide, such as the director or assistant director). The second respondent was a social service worker, preferably a social worker, but at least a social service aide or assistant (i.e., one employed in a non-supervisory capacity). In cases where the agency employed more than one social service worker, the senior worker was selected. (The term "social service worker" or "service worker" will be used throughout the report to designate a non-supervisory member of the Social Service Component).

Based on the definition of a social service unit, two interviews were planned for each of 33 agencies; twenty interviews for one agency (data equivalent to ten units); and four interviews were planned for each of the two remaining medium size agencies. Only one interview was planned for an agency in which the social worker was temporarily holding the position of acting director. The total possible number of respondents, therefore, during the planning phase was 95.

Training for the Evaluation Staff interviews was provided a week before the scheduled interviews. Each of the interviews was provided with a list of contact persons, common terminologies used in social work, instructions for completing the questionnaire, and instructions to explain the purpose and to assure confidentiality of the information.

Data were collected from 35 (95%) of the 37 agencies under consideration. The final data collection represented two responses for each of 27 units (24 agencies) and one response from 13 units (11 agencies). The final number of respondents was 67 or 71% of the total possible 95. Seventy-seven percent of the intended supervisors and 64% of the intended social service workers were interviewed.

It is emphasized that, except in the case where one social worker was serving as the acting director of an agency, two responses had been planned for all units. In actuality, however, two interviews for each unit were not obtained universally because of time constraints and scheduling problems. Hence, for some units, there was only one interview conducted, and the responses were treated as "single response" units. The 27 units from which two responses were obtained were treated as "dual response" units.

Data reduction was done manually. Analysis was uniformly performed in terms of percentages of respondents.

The basic data tables are found in Appendix B. Each table is organized for reporting on a particular issue. In almost all tables there are two major sections. One section is titled "dual response" (with sub-categories of "supervisor" and "service worker" responses). The second section is titled "total response" (also separating the "supervisor" and "service worker" responses) which are the totals of both the "dual responses" and "single response" units.

The findings under "dual response" constitute the primary focus of analysis for this report, in accordance with the initial design of the study. When "dual response" and "total response" patterns are similar, it is fairly certain that the 27 "dual responses" represent the state of affairs for the total Social Services Component of Title IV-A. In cases where the findings under "dual response" differ from "total response," the differences will be noted; otherwise, the reader may assume that both "dual response" and "total response" findings are similar.

One final comment on the tables is needed. Under "dual response" (or imbedded in them) each of the answers from 27 pairs of matched respondents. The degree of agreement of the "matched pairs" is of importance, and is noted as a footnote in 23 of the tables.

The remainder of this report is divided into two main parts: I. Major Findings and Discussion, and II. Summary and Conclusions. Part I is further subdivided into six sections: an initial section describes the typical social service setting, and five subsequent sections describe the findings related to each of the five major questions, noted earlier, which were posed as the objectives for this portion of the study.

A. Setting

Tables B-1 to B-13 in Appendix B yield the information for this first subsection which describes the setting in which the Social Services Component operates.

Of the 35 Agencies, 29 were non-fee programs exclusively, and 6 were combined fee and non-fee programs. Almost half of the agencies employed 11 to 20 staff in total, and the average ratio of social service personnel to the total staff was one to ten (1:10). The total number of social service positions allocated was 201: 25 social service coordinator, unit leader, or social service supervisor positions, 81 social work positions, 84 assistant/aide positions, and 11 positions classified as "other" (e.g., parent contact worker, bi-lingual aide). Fourteen vacant positions existed during the time data were collected.

The remaining characteristics describing the "setting" are based upon the collective perceptions of the interviewees. Thus, in describing the setting, differences and similarities in perceptions about the setting are highlighted.

Respondents were asked whether aides' job functions differed from social workers' job functions in their unit. Thirty percent of the supervisors and social workers said the functions did not differ, 19% of the supervisors and 30% of the service workers said they did differ. Fifty-two percent of the supervisors and 41% of the service workers said that the question did not apply to their unit. Ten (37%) of the 27 matched pairs (within the "dual responses") were not in agreement with each other regarding whether there was difference of function or not.

Nearly 40% of both the supervisors and social service workers indicated that social workers reported directly to the director of the agency/center/program. Twenty-seven percent of the supervisors and 15% of the service workers reported that a social worker had two supervisors, that is, an administrative supervisor and a supervisor to develop professional skills. Twenty-six percent of both the supervisors and service workers indicated that a service worker also reported to "someone else" (besides the prime individual identified) in that they were accountable to external offices for activities such as determining eligibility and maintaining attendance records, health records, and time sheets.

About 60% of both the supervisors and social service workers indicated that non-social service personnel within the agency also carried out social service functions such as completing eligibility, attendance, and other forms. Slightly more social service workers (37%) than supervisors (30%) indicated that volunteers participated in the component's activities. On the whole, however, volunteers were not used extensively in the Social Services Component. More than half of those volunteers noted were college students. Parents were the next largest group of volunteers. Other volunteers identified were either trained volunteers of the agency or community citizens. College student volunteers did intake, interviewing, and home visiting, and they carried a limited caseload. Parent volunteers organized meetings, notified other parents of meetings, or acted as a

liaison between the agency and the family. Other volunteers conducted escort services, home visits, and clerical tasks.

When a service worker was absent due to sickness or vacation, someone in the agency might "cover" or "substitute for that worker." A greater percentage of supervisors (63%) than service workers (41%) reported that work "coverage" was provided between March through August, 1975, but 37% of the supervisors and 59% of the service workers reported that no substitution had occurred.

The most frequently identified individuals substituting for service workers, according to supervisors were "directors or assistant directors." On the other hand, social service workers identified "other social services staff." The "social service supervisor," "head teacher," "secretary" or "other professions" were other individuals in general.

To conclude the discussion on the characteristics of the social service setting, the following findings are noteworthy. A) In all tables, the findings in "dual response" did not differ from the results under "total response." B) Supervisors and service workers had basically the same perceptions regarding the following: 1) the chain of command and the accountability of the service worker to "someone else" besides the prime individual identified, 2) whether or not volunteers participated in the component's activities, 3) the number of volunteers, and 4) the type of activities undertaken by the volunteers. C) On the other hand, supervisors and service workers did not agree on the following: 1) whether aides were employed in the agencies, 2) whether aides' job functions differed from the social workers' job functions, and 3) how the job functions differed. D) Noticeable discrepancies were found between matched pairs regarding whether aides' and social workers' functions differed, and the nature of

the workers' accountability to others. The differences in responses between supervisors and service workers and between matched pair responses regarding differences in aides' and social workers' job functions suggest that a lack of communication may exist within a number of social service units.

B. Intake and Admission

Question 1 was concerned with the intake and admission process:

> What are the typical admission procedure, i.e., who is involved and what information is shared between the family and agency?

Respondents were requested to indicate for each person identified whether that person was "required," "preferred" (presence was desirable), "allowed," or "not allowed" to be present in the intake interview. According to almost all respondents, the presence of both the parent and social worker was "required." The presence of the child was noted equally as being "required," "preferred," or "allowed" during the intake interview. Social service supervisors and aides were generally "allowed" to be present during the intake interview (for those agencies in which the position actually existed). "Referral source representative," "other parent representative," and "director or head teacher" were "allowed to be present." Two of every three respondents identified "others" who were either "allowed" or "required" to be present. Those "others" identified were generally nurses, psychologists, and interpreters. (Table B14).

Respondents generally agreed as to who may or may not be involved at intake. Intake tended, however, to be a "one-to-one" type of meeting between the parent and service worker.

Tables 1 and 2 show what information was shared between the family and agency at intake. Table 1 identifies what information was collected from the family, and Table 2 identifies what information was given to the family.

TABLE I

TYPES OF INFORMATION COLLECTED BY SERVICE WORKERS FROM FAMILIES

Types Of Information	Dual Response				Total Response			
	Supervisor N = 27		Service Worker N = 27		Supervisor N = 37		Service Worker N = 30	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Need for Day Care	27	100%	27	100%	36	99%	30	100%
Family/Social History	27	100%	25	93%	35	95%	25	83%
Developmental History	27	100%	26	96%	37	100%	29	97%
Demographic Data (e.g., address)	27	100%	27	100%	37	100%	30	100%
Employment Status	27	100%	26	96%	37	100%	29	97%
Emergency Contacts	27	100%	25	93%	37	100%	28	93%
Financial Status	27	100%	26	96%	36	97%	29	97%
Parent's reaction to the center	22	81%	22	81%	29	78%	25	83%
Parent's expectation of the center	24	89%	24	89%	33	89%	27	90%
Child's reaction to the center	21	78%	19	70%	29	78%	22	73%
Escort Arrangements	25	93%	25	93%	33	89%	26	87%
Diagnosis of Child's Handicap	20	74%	18	67%	24	64%	19	63%
Allergies and food preferences	27	100%	24	89%	37	100%	27	90%
Record of Medical History:								
Immunizations	27	100%	25	93%	37	100%	28	93%
Physical Examination	24	89%	22	81%	31	83%	24	80%
Dental Care	19	70%	14	52%	24	64%	16	53%
Child's Functioning Level according to Parents:								
Cognitive	26	96%	24	89%	35	95%	26	87%
Behavior/Emotional	27	100%	25	93%	37	100%	27	90%
Social Interaction	27	100%	25	93%	37	100%	27	90%
Motor Activity and Perception	26	96%	23	85%	35	95%	25	83%
Psychological Screening	12	44%	15	56%	16	43%	16	53%
Permission Forms:								
Trips and Releases	23	85%	24	89%	33	89%	26	87%
Medical and Prescriptions	13	48%	23	85%	21	56%	25	83%

According to 80% or more respondents, data for 18 of 23 items were obtained from parents during the intake interview. These items were: the need for day care, the family/social history, the child's developmental history, demographic data, employment status, emergency contacts, financial status, parents' reaction to the center (program), parents' expection of the center (program), escort arrangements, child's allergies and food preferences, medical history of immunizations, physical examination dates and information, parents' assessments of the child's cognitive, behavioral/emotional, social, motor and perceptual development, and the completion of "trip and release" forms.

A lower proportion of respondents (70% - 79%) said that information was obtained about the child's reaction to the center (program), diagnosis of the child's handicaps, and dental care history. Two items least likely to be mentioned were "psychological screening" data and "medical release and prescriptions" forms.

Supervisors' and service workers' responses differed for two items on the list: "dental care" information and "medical release and prescriptions" forms. For all other items there was substantial agreement in the perceptions of the supervisors and service workers.

In responding to questions about what information was given to the family, respondents indicated whether explanations of the agency's program, services, policies and rules were given, and whether these were merely "discussed," "discussed and written," "written but not discussed" or the question was "not applicable." Table 2 shows the primary response for each area; the data by "dual" and "total response" categories are found in Table B-15 in Appendix B.

TABLE 2

DISCUSSION AREAS BY SERVICE WORKERS
BEFORE A FAMILY IS ADMITTED TO
DAY CARE

Areas Of Discussion	Dual Response*								Total Response							
	Supervisor				Service Worker				Supervisor				Service Worker			
	Discussed	Discussed and Written	Written	Not Applicable	Discussed	Discussed and Written	Written	Not Applicable	Discussed	Discussed and Written	Written	Not Applicable	Discussed	Discussed and Written	Written	Not Applicable
Agency's Program and Services:																
Career Development for parent	X			X	X				X			X	X			
Daily Activities for child	X	X			X				X	X			X			
Education Programs for child	X			X	X			X	X	X			X			X
Employment Opportunities for parent in center	X			X	X			X	X	X		X	X			X
Evaluation of centers	X				X				X				X			
Evaluation of child	X				X				X				X			
Health Program of the center	X				X				X				X	X		
Nutrition Program of the center	X				X				X				X			
Parent organization of the center	X				X				X				X			
Speech, language, hearing services of the center	X				X				X				X			
Social Services of the center	X			X	X			X				X				X
Treatment program for the center																
Policies and Rules of the Agency:																
Clothing	X	X			X	X			X	X				X		
Confidentiality of information	X				X				X				X			
Admission Procedure	X				X				X				X			
Termination of Services	X				X				X				X			
Eligibility Requirements	X	X			X				X	X			X			
Fees				X				X				X				X
Financial Responsibilitjes				X				X				X				X
Hours of Care	X															
Medical Condition of the child	X	X			X	X			X	X			X	X		
Preplacement of the child	X	X			X	X			X	X			X			
Responsibilities for meals																
Rights and responsibilities of the family	X				X				X				X			
Transportation and pick-up	X				X				X				X			
Other:																
Agency's goals and objectives	X				X				X				X			
Facilities	X				X				X				X			
Tour of the center (conducted)	X				X				X				X			

*Dual responses did not agree on 22 of 27 pairs (81%).

Services tended to be "discussed" more often than "discussed and written." This was true for 17 of the 28 items according to supervisors and for 19 of the 28 items according to service workers. Both supervisors and service workers reported "Fees" and "Financial responsibilities" as being "not applicable." Supervisors also identified "Treatment program for the child" as "not applicable." Both supervisors and service workers reported "Educational programs for the child" and "Employment opportunities for parent" were either "discussed" or "not applicable." In addition, supervisors identified "Treatment program for the child" and "Transportation and pick-up" as being "discussed" or "not applicable." Both supervisors and service workers reported that "Clothing," "Hours of care," "Medical condition of the child" were either "discussed" or "discussed and written." Supervisors also reported that "Eligibility requirements" and "Daily activities for the child" were either "discussed" or "discussed and written."

Social service workers' responses differed from supervisors' on four items; "career development," "daily activities," "eligibility requirements," and "transportation and pick-up." With the exception of these four items, supervisors' and service workers' perceptions were generally the same.

In general most of the items listed in the two tables were shared with and collected from parents during the intake interviews. It appears that families seeking services from any of the 35 agencies would receive similar information. Although most of the items in Table 2 were "discussed" with families rather than "discussed and written," the items (based upon policy sections 4670-72 of the 4600 Regulations), were generally a part of most agencies' intake process.

The proportions of supervisor responses ("dual" and "total responses") were similar with the exception of those for "Educational program for the child" and "Hours of care." The proportions of responses were also similar for the service workers under "total response" and "dual response" with the exception of those for "Health program of the center," "clothing," and "Medical condition of the child." Twenty-two (81%) of the 27 "matched pairs" were not in agreement for 5 or more of the 28 items listed. This level of disagreement show that supervisors and service workers were not actually in agreement to the extent that the data in general might have suggested, which further indicates a possible lack of communication between the service worker and supervisor in each agency.

A further step in the investigation of intake and admission procedures required respondents to place in sequential order a series of 3 x 5 index cards. Each card listed a possible step in the agency's admission process. Because no two respondents listed the steps in identical order, key items were selected for discussion. The first of these selected analyses is whether specific information was shared with the family before or after the family was admitted to day care.

Supervisors and service workers agreed (about 75% of both) that an explanation of services and policies was provided before the family was admitted to day care. In about 5% of the cases, information was shared after the family was admitted. The remainder did not identify when an explanation of services and policies was shared with the family. (Table B16)

Supervisors and service workers were not in agreement, however, with respect to when an explanation of services was given in relation to a family

being placed on a waiting list. Forty-eight percent of the supervisors reported information was shared before a family was placed on a waiting list, while 26% of the service workers reporting this to be the case. Further, only 7% of the supervisors reported information was shared after a family was placed on a waiting list compared to 26% of the service workers. (Thirty-four percent of the supervisors compared to 48% of the service workers did not identify if or when the explanations were given.) Thus it seems that more supervisors than service workers perceived that explanations were given, and that this was done before a family was placed on a waiting list. (Table B17)

Supervisors and service workers also were not in agreement concerning when probable eligibility was determined, before or after a family was placed on a waiting list. (Probable eligibility is the service worker's estimate of eligibility aside from the County Office of Assistance's official decision.) In almost half the cases, both supervisors and service workers failed to order the cards with "probable eligibility" or "waiting list" on them. Forty-five percent of the supervisors reported that probable eligibility was done prior to placing the family on a waiting list compared to 30% of the service workers. Five percent of the supervisors reported probable eligibility was done after the family was placed on a waiting list, while 18% of the service workers reported this to be the case. Thus supervisors perceived probable eligibility to be determined prior to placing a family on a waiting list, as did service workers, but a greater proportion of supervisors than service workers perceived it this way. (Table B18)

For both issues (explanation of services and probable eligibility), however, the conclusions must be considered tentative since so few respondents even used these cards to "show" events in chronological order.

Finally concerning the number of family visits required before a family is admitted to day care, 63% of the service workers reported "one visit" was necessary, 15% said "two visits," and 15% did not respond. On the other hand, 44% of the supervisors indicated "one visit," 22% said "two visits," and 26% did not respond. Two major differences were found between the supervisors' and service workers' responses to this item. Supervisors thought fewer visits to the center by the family were needed than did service workers, but more supervisors left the item "blank;" this may suggest that supervisors were less knowledgeable about the number of visits required. (Table B19)

C. Ineligibility Situations

Question 2. When a child/family is ineligible for day care what actions are taken by the agency?

In requesting the respondents to order the intake and admission cards, three items were included for their specific implications regarding ineligibility situations. These items centered on whether certain information was provided to the family after ineligibility was determined by the County Assistance Office (CAO). These were: (1) does the family wish to appeal the decision (card #19), (2) was the family referred to a community agency (non-day care) (card #14), and (3) was the family referred to another day care center (card #20). Responses are summarized in Table 3.

TABLE 3

SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE AGENCY TO FAMILIES RULED INELIGIBLE BY COUNTY ASSISTANCE OFFICE

Type of Services	Dual Response**				Total Response			
	Supervisor N = 27		Service Worker N = 27		Supervisor N = 37		Service Worker N = 30	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentabe	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Determination whether family wishes to appeal	16	59%	16	59%	26	70%	18	60%
Family referred to a community agency	18	66%	15	55%	24	64%	17	56%
Family referred to another day care agency	16	59%	19	70%	23	62%	21	70%
Blank	6	22%	4	15%	6	16%	4	13%
Other	2	7%	0	0%	2	5%	0	0%

** Dual responses did not agree for 4 of 27 pairs (15%).

In 59% of the cases, both supervisors and service workers reported that it was determined whether or not the family wished to appeal CAO's decision. More supervisors (66%) than service workers (55%) reported that families were referred to a community agency, but supervisors reported less frequently (59%) than service workers (70%) that a family was referred to another day care center.

Only four (15%) of the 27 matched pairs disagreed with each other, indicating a fairly reliable response from each unit. The conclusion emerges that supervisors and service workers had slightly different perceptions of what referrals were made after the family was determined ineligible by CAO.

In another vein, fifty-two percent of the supervisors and 41% of the service workers indicated that service workers assisted with an appeal. Another 22% of the supervisors and 30% of the service workers reported that the service workers did not assist the family with an appeal. Four percent of the service workers and 11% of the supervisors responded "don't know." Generally, more supervisors than service workers thought that assistance was given families in appealing a CAO decision, but for both groups the responses indicated that only about half of the agencies would provide the assistance. (Table B20)

Eighty-one percent of both the supervisors and service workers also reported that appeals had not occurred within the past year, 15% of both reported that appeals had occurred, and 6% of both did not respond. The proportions were slightly different under "dual response" and "total response;" the proportions for supervisors showing the greater difference.

The number of reported appeals, then, was very small. Only two supervisors reported that appeals had occurred three times, two did not respond, and the question did not apply to the remainder. Three service workers each reported one appeal in the last year, one reported six, and the question did not apply to the remainder. No general agreement appeared between the supervisors and service workers in terms of the number of appeals during the last year except that they were not frequent. (Tables B21 and B22)

D. Priorities at Admission

Question 3. What are the priorities used at each agency/center for the admission of a child?

If a number of families were eligible for admission to the day care program (i.e., they had met CAO's standards) but the agency can select only one of these families, what are the criteria used to choose among them? Table 4 shows the agency's internal priorities for determining which family would be admitted to day care. Nineteen priorities are listed alphabetically. The last category, "Unspecified," includes DPW priorities and general priorities which could not be further categorized.

Both supervisors and service workers identified "date of application" as the most common priority for admission. Supervisors placed "age of child" as the second factor followed by "child with multiple psychological problems" or "family size." On the other hand, service workers placed "child with multiple psychological problems" second, followed by "parent's physical or mental health." The distribution of responses suggests that each pair of supervisors and service workers did not identify the same priorities for admission, and therefore the priorities may not be clearly established in each unit.

A final aspect related to the intake and admission process is the worker's authority to admit and terminate day care services to a family. Seventy percent of the supervisors and 52% of the service workers reported that the social service workers had the authority to grant admission. Some disagreement existed between respondents in matched pairs. Eight (26%) of the 27 pairs were not in agreement with each other.

In the majority of the cases, those who had the authority to grant admission also consulted other individuals. The predominant individual identified was the "director" of the agency, center, or program. Other

TABLE 4

AGENCY'S PRIORITIES FOR ADMITTING FAMILIES
WHO ARE ELIGIBLE FOR SERVICES

Priorities**	Dual Response				Total Response			
	Supervisor N = 26		Service Worker N = 23		Supervisor N = 34		Service Worker N = 24	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Affiliation with hospital	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%
Age of Child	7	27%	2	9%	9	25%	2	8%
Age of Parent	1	4%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%
Child needs peer relation relationship	1	4%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%
Child with multiple psychological problems	6	23%	7	30%	9	25%	7	29%
Child in protective custody	1	4%	1	4%	3	8%	1	4%
Date of Application	15	58%	14	61%	19	54%	15	62%
Family in project area	1	4%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%
Family size	6	23%	2	9%	7	20%	2	8%
Fee/non fee	1	4%	1	4%	1	2%	1	4%
Geographic location	4	15%	2	9%	8	22%	2	8%
Parent's physical/mental health	3	12%	5	22%	3	8%	5	20%
Race or religion	2	8%	2	9%	2	5%	2	8%
Refugee family	1	4%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%
Retarded sibling	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%
Sex of child	4	15%	3	13%	5	14%	3	12%
Single or student parent	2	8%	1	4%	2	5%	1	4%
Transferred, referral, or returning	2	8%	2	9%	2	5%	2	8%
Unspecified	13	50%	9	39%	16	45%	9	37%

**Multiple responses were accepted.

key individuals identified were the "head teacher" and caregivers."

In cases where the worker did not have the authority to grant admission, the director and the social service supervisor were identified most frequently by both supervisors and service workers as the individuals who made the decision to admit a family into the program. Supervisors identified the "head teacher" and "psychologist or other specialist" more frequently than did service workers. Some service workers, but no supervisors, identified the "admission committee" or "consultants" as having the authority to admit the family. (Table B23 to B26)

Seventy-eight percent of the supervisors and 85% of the service workers reported that service workers did not have the authority to terminate services to families in day care programs. The remainder reported that service workers had "total" authority or "conditional" authority to terminate services to families in day care. (Table B27) Eighty-one percent of the supervisors and 83% of the service workers identified the "director" as the individual having the authority to terminate services to the family. Fourteen supervisors and 15 service workers reported that the decision was made by a group. This group seemed to be composed of the "director," "social worker or social service supervisor," and "lead or head teacher." (Table B28)

Fourteen (52%) of the 27 matched pairs were not in agreement with each other as to who could terminate services. The data suggest that workers had less authority to terminate services than to admit families, and since half of the respondents in matched pairs disagreed on which individual or individuals could terminate services, it was apparently not clear who had the authority to terminate services to the family.

The criteria established by an agency to terminate services to a family in day care, excluding consideration of the child's age, CAO's standards, and the family's request for termination, were based on "absence," "child disabled beyond services of the center or chronic illness," "lack of parent's cooperation in the parent program," "disruptive child," "moving, or living too far from the center," "tardiness," "transfer to another agency," and "lack of cooperation in providing information." Six respondents ("total response" only) reported that service workers in their units had only conditional authority to terminate services. The most frequently mentioned conditions for this were "excess absences" and "lack of parent's cooperation in agency policies." (Tables B29 and B30) Supervisors identified "excessive absence" and "lack of parent cooperation in the program" more often, and "child disabled beyond services of the center" or "chronic illness" less often than did service workers.

Both categories of respondents primarily identified the service worker as the individual who determined the day the child began day care. Thirty-seven percent of the supervisors and 33% service workers identified the "teacher," and 33% of the supervisors and 30% of the service workers identified the "director" as other key individuals who determined the day the child began day care. However, in 18 (67%) of 27 matched pairs, respondents disagreed with each other. The discrepancies found between matched pairs indicate that who determines the day the child attends day care is not clearly established in the program. (Table B31)

The individual most frequently identified as the one who determined the care group to which the child would be assigned was the "service worker."

This was followed by the "teacher" and the "director" of the agency, center, or program. The data showed agreement between supervisors and service workers. However, 63% of the supervisors and 48% of the service workers reported that the decision was made by a group. Furthermore, 11 (41%) of 27 matched pairs were not in agreement. Thus, although the response patterns of supervisors and service workers showed agreement, supervisors and service workers disagreed on whether it was an individual or a group who determined the care group to which the child was assigned, and 41% of the respondents in matched pairs did not agree. It apparently was unclear to the respondents who determined the care group to which the child was assigned. (Table B32)

Finally, both supervisors and service workers identified the "social service worker" as the single person who most often determined the time of day (i.e., the hour) the child began day care. Supervisors then identified the "director," or "no one (policy)," followed by "parent." The service workers identified (in order of frequency after "social service worker") the "parent," "director," and "no one (policy)" as the determiner of the time of day the child started. Fifty-five percent of the supervisors and 37% of the service workers reported that the decision was made by a group. Nineteen (70%) of the 27 matched pairs were not in agreement with each other. Thus it was also apparent that the respondents did not know who determined the time of day the child was to begin attending the day care program. (Table B33)

Summary of Questions 1-3

The following summarizes the discussion regarding question 1-3, i.e., the typical admission procedure. Parents and service workers were required to be present in the intake interview. The child may or may not have been required to be present. Other individuals were allowed to be present. In more than four of every five cases, 18 or 19 of the 23 items listed in Table 1 were reported to be collected before admission. "Psychological screening," "records of dental care," "child's handicap," "child's reaction to the center," were collected less often than all other items listed. Two of every three items listed in Table 2 were discussed before the child was admitted. "Fees," and "financial responsibilities" were usually not discussed since most programs were "non-fee" programs. There was some disagreement on whether "treatment program for the child" was or was not discussed before the child was admitted. Generally, family information was "discussed," less frequently it was both "discussed and written," and seldom was it ever "written" only.

In three of every four cases, an explanation of an agency's services, policies, and rules was given to a family prior to their admission into day care. Approximately one of every three supervisors and one of every two service workers did not indicate that a waiting list existed, but one of every two supervisors and one of every four service workers indicated that an explanation of services was provided to a family <u>prior</u> to placing a family on a waiting list. Usually, probable eligibility was not determined before a family was placed on a waiting list, but when probable eligibility was determined, supervisors more frequently than service workers reported that it was done <u>prior</u> to placing the family on a waiting list.

Families generally would make one visit to the agency before their children would be admitted to day care. If a family was deemed ineligible by CAO, in three of every five cases, service workers ascertained whether the family wished to appeal the decision. For just over half of the responses it was indicated that service workers referred families to community (non-day care) agencies or to other day care agencies. One of every two service workers and two of every five supervisors indicated that the family would be assisted in appealing CAO's decision of ineligibility. One of every five respondents said that appeals had been made within the last year, but the number of appeals reported was minimal.

Excluding the requirements of being eligible for day care as determined by CAO, the agencies' own priorities for admission were (in order of frequency) "date of application," "age of the child," or the "child with multiple problems," or "parent's physical or mental health." Excluding the "child's age," "family's request to terminate services," and CAO's standards," the agency's internal termination policies were (in order of frequency) "excessive absences," "chronic illness or child too disabled to benefit from the program," or "lack of parent's cooperation in the program."

More than one of every two service workers had the authority to grant admission, but less than one of every four had the authority to terminate day care services to a family. Service workers usually consulted other individuals regarding termination of services, such persons being either the director or head teacher. The director was the single individual identified most frequently as the one consulted, or (where the social service worker did not have the authority) the one to make the decision to admit a family or terminate services. The service worker was identified most frequently

as the person who determined the day, time, and class to which the child was assigned in day care. In half the cases, the decision was a combined staff effort.

Service workers and supervisors gave similar responses about who was involved at intake, what information was collected and shared at intake, when the explanation of agency's services, policies and rules were given to the family, and who had the authority to remove the child. They gave different responses regarding the number of families placed on a waiting list, whether explanation of services was provided before or after a family was placed on a waiting list, whether probable eligibility was determined before or after a family was placed on a waiting list, the number of visits required for the intake interview, the type of referral made after a family was found ineligible for services by CAO, whether workers assisted with an appeal, and the number of appeals. They also differed regarding priorities for admission, the authority to grant admission or terminate services, the group to which the child was assigned, the time and day the child began, and the criteria for terminating services.

E. Professional Growth and Development

For the period September, 1974 to August, 1975, both supervisors and service workers reported one of every five aides and one of every five social workers was promoted within the past year. However, in more than half of those units, even though aides were not employed, none of the respondents used the "not applicable" response for this question. (No explanation is provided as to why the respondents did not indicate "not applicable.") In contrast, about half of both supervisors and service workers used the "not applicable" response concerning the number of social workers promoted within the past year. Since almost every unit had at least one social worker, "not applicable" evidently meant that there was no career ladder beyond the social work position (arrangement for promotion) in those units. Discounting the surprising use of the "not applicable" response, the number of social workers promoted during the past year agreed with the findings in the prior study concerning the profile of social service personnel. (Table B34)

Given the above, and noting that service workers (especially social workers) must possess the "potential for professional growth and development" (not defined further by the 4600 Regulations), orientation, training, and the subsidization of training were selected as key indicators to address Question 4.

Question 4. How does the component provide professional growth and development for social service workers?

Approximately 70% of both supervisors and service workers reported that new workers were provided with an orientation upon employment. Most of the remaining said that the question was "not applicable." (Table B35)

Fifty-two percent of the supervisors and 63% of the service workers reported that internal staff training programs were specifically developed and conducted for service workers during the period June to August, 1975; the remaining in each category said they were not. Twelve (44%) of 27 matched pairs did not agree, suggesting that it was not known by the respondents whether internal training programs were or were not developed for service workers. However, of those reporting that there were internal training programs, both supervisors and service workers reported that "Discussion on Special Topics" and "Techniques for Working with Parents" were the primary topic areas. In addition, service workers reported "Child Development" as a primary topic area. (Tables B36 and B37)

Supervisors (78%) and service workers (60%) reported that service workers participated in training programs provided by external agencies. The remaining portions of the supervisors and service workers reported "no". Although service workers identified "Day Care Services" and "Other Day Care Agencies" more frequently than supervisors, both reported (in decreasing order) that the major providers of training were "Day Care Services," "Professional Organizations," and "Other Day Care Agencies." Discrepancies between matched pairs occurred in 5 (19%) of 26 pairs which indicates that both service workers and supervisors understood who the providers of external training programs were. (Table B38 and B39)

Topics of external training programs were reported in vague terms, such as "conferences," "workshops," or "Support Group," and only a minimal number of specific areas were identified. The areas identified were "Discussion of Special Topics," "Form Procedures," "Therapy Techniques," and "Techniques in Working with Parents." (Table B40)

Respondents were also requested to identify other means of achieving professional growth excluding workshops and courses. One of every four supervisors and one of every two service workers did not respond. Supervisors identified "Journals and Other Professional Literature" while service workers identified "Consultants" as the other major mode for achieving professional growth. Since the supervisors and service workers did not identify common modes of training, it may be that they responded only in terms applicable to themselves. (Table B41)

In relation to the means of subsidizing training, the three primary methods identified by both supervisors and service workers in decreasing order were "Release Time with Pay," "Partial Payment," and "Release Time without Pay." Supervisors identified more types of subsidies than service workers. (Table B42)

In summary, the data pertaining to Question 4 showed that an orientation was given to service workers upon employment with the agency. More than half the respondents reported that internal staff training programs were provided for the service workers. These programs focused on "Techniques in Working with Parents" and "Discussion on Special Topics." More than half of the respondents indicated that service workers were involved in external training programs. According to most respondents, training programs were provided by "Day Care Services" and (less frequently) by "Professional Organizations" or "Other Day Care Agencies." The topics of training were generally vague but "Techniques in Therapy," "Procedures in Completing Forms," and "Techniques in Working with Parents" were some of the more specific areas identified. Other modes of achieving professional growth

were reported by supervisors as "Journals or Professional Literature," while service workers reported "Consultants." Training was usually reported to have been through "Release Time with Pay" and less frequently reported to have been through "Partial Payment." (Table B42)

Service workers and supervisors were in agreement concerning provision of an orientation for new workers. Agreement was found in the ordering of responses but differences in the frequencies were found for areas pertaining to topics of internal and external training programs, providers of external training programs and methods of subsidizing training for growth and development. Matched pairs had good agreement on the number of external training programs but poor agreement on the number of internal training programs.

F. Criteria for Determining Workloads

The questionnaire used to obtain social service workers' profiles, and the interview form used in this study, both asked for the average number of families assigned to each social service staff position. Both supervisors and service workers in the interviews reported the median number of families serviced by an agency or center was between 51-60 families. Also, both supervisors and service workers reported the median number of families assigned to a social worker was 31-40 families. These figures comply with those established in the prior study. Three of every four supervisors and two of every three service workers reported that their agency had "no assistants or aides" or that the number of families assigned to assistants/aides was "unspecified." Therefore, the number of families assigned to an assistant/aide will not be discussed due to lack of sufficient data. (Tables B43 and B44)

Since the worker's caseload ranged from "less than 20" to "51 to 60" families per worker in this study and "less than 20" to "81 plus" in the prior study, the major question to be answered here, is:

Question 5. What are the criteria for determining the workload for the social service workers?

The respondents identified the general "formulae" their agencies used to arrive at the caseload for each service worker, and these were categorized and displayed in Table 5. The bulk of the responses to the question were found primarily in two categories: the worker was assigned "all the families in the center" (applicable to units with only one service worker), or that "number of families determined by dividing the number of families by the number of workers." Supervisors' responses were evenly distributed for

TABLE 5

GENERAL "FORMULAE" FOR DETERMINING SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS' CASELOAD

Formulae Category	Dual Response				Total Response			
	Supervisor		Service Worker		Supervisor		Service Worker	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	percentage	Number	Percentage
Total of Families divided by number of workers	5	19%	6	22%	5	14%	6	20%
All Families assigned to the worker	7	26%	6	22%	14	38%	7	23%
Each worker responsible for all families	3	11%	3	11%	3	8%	4	13%
Number of families (maximum) set by Agency policy	3	11%	2	7%	4	11%	2	7%
Supervisors descretion	3	11%	1	4%	3	8%	2	7%
Other (e.g.**)	3	11%	5	19%	5	13%	5	17%
Blank or N.A.	3	11%	4	15%	3	8%	4	13%
Total	27	100%	27	100%	37	100%	30	100%

**(e.g. no clear method, depends on enrollment, worker's experience matched with family needs and hours available for casework)

the remaining five categories, but the service workers' responses were not.

The pattern found under the supervisor column in "total response" was different from that under "dual response." The major emphasis under the supervisor column in "total response" was "all families assigned to the worker." The pattern found under the service worker column in "total response" was similar to the pattern under "dual response." In general, it appears as though the assignment of caseloads was simply dependent upon how many families and service workers there were, regardless of training, experience, or position.

Respondents were asked to estimate the percentage of families per service worker in need of or requesting services beyond day care placement. Two of every five supervisors and one of every two service workers reported that between 0-49% of the families per service worker were in need of additional services. One of every four supervisors and two of every five service workers reported that between 50-99% of the families needed additional services. Three of every ten supervisors and less than one of every ten service workers reported ALL families needed services beyond day care placement. The median percentage range of families (per service worker's caseload) in need of additional services and reported by both service workers and supervisors was 60-69%. Fifteen (56%) of 27 pairs were not in agreement with each other. The data seem to suggest that supervisors were more inclined to believe that families needed additional services than service workers. (Table B45)

Development of a Service Plan

An inquiry about the development of a service plan for families in need of additional services (a standard social service procedure) was made

in order to make some assessment of how service workers carried out their planning for service delivery. Three of every four of both supervisors and service workers indicated that the service worker developed a service plan for a family. Seven (26%) of the 27 matched pairs were not in agreement with each other, which suggests that some units have not clearly established whether service plans are developed for the family. (Table B46)

Supervisors were equally divided on reporting that service plans were "written only," "oral only," and "written and oral." On the other hand, service workers indicated it was "oral only" (50%), with fewer workers reporting it was "written and oral" (25%), and "written only" (15%). Of the 16 matched pairs which agreed that a service plan was developed, 9 of the 16 pairs did not agree on the mode in which it was developed. Thus, the data seem to suggest that the mode in which service plans were developed was not clearly established in some units, and supervisors reported that plans were developed on a more formal level (written) than did the service workers. (Table B47)

The development of a service plan was thought to be best analyzed as a "four-step" procedure. The steps included: 1) analysis of the family's situation to identify the critical factors requiring service, 2) defining the relationships among the factors to determine which need is to be handled first,3) considering possible alternatives regarding how to provide services, and 4) selecting the specific approach (services) to be undertaken. More service workers (25%) identified the "four-step" procedure than did the supervisors (10%). (This might be due to the fact that some "social service supervisors" were directors who had little background in the social service field.) Of the 16 matched pairs which reported service plans were developed, none of the pairs agreed in identifying the same steps. The findings suggest

that the basic content or format for developing a service plan varied among units, and that uniformity as to the basic steps which compose an agency's service plan was not evident among supervisors and service workers. (Table B48)

The majority of both superisors and service workers agreed that plans were developed by the "professional staff alone" and less often by "parents, service workers, and other professional agency staff." The remaining indicated that "parents and social service workers," the "director," or the "parent alone" developed the plan. Of the 16 matched pairs, half were not in agreement with each other, which indicates the respondents were not sure of who was involved in developing the plans. (Table B49)

Both supervisors and service workers reported that plans were used in "discussion with the parents." Fewer supervisors reported that the plan was for the "social worker's use only" and "staff use only," and supervisors reported that the "plan was given to parents" more often than did the service workers. Seven of the 16 matched pairs were not in agreement. It appears that both parties did not perceive the same purpose for the subsequent use of the service plan. (Table B50)

In summary, the data indicated that supervisors were inclined more than service workers to believe that a greater percentage of families needed additional services. The median percentage of families (per service worker) in need or requesting services was 60-69% of the worker's caseload. In three out of four cases, service plans were developed, but supervisors reported it was "written," "oral," or "written and oral" while service workers reported it was "oral." Service plans were used for discussion with the parents. However, it appears that the functions of these plans were limited in that only one of every ten supervisors and only one of every four service workers formulated the plans according to the "four-step" procedure. Furthermore,

supervisors and service workers did not perceive the use of the plans the same way.

Matched pairs did not agree (56%) regarding the percentage of families in need of services beyond day care placement, and 26% were not in agreement as to whether a service plan was developed for the families. Of the 16 matched pairs which agreed that service plans were developed, 56% did not agree as to whether a service plan was "written," "verbal," or "both written and oral;" 100% did not agree in identifying the "four-step" procedure in developing the service plan, 50% did not agree as to who were involved in the development of a service plan, and 44% did not agree concerning the subsequent use of the service plan. The discrepancies seem to suggest that the use of a service plan as a basic social service "tool" (i.e., the development of a service plan) was not supported in the day care Social Service Component.

Regarding another aspect of this broad issue more supervisors (89%) then service workers (78%) reported that a central file of community resources was available in their agency, while the remaining number reported no central file was available in the agency. Sixteen (59%) of the 27 matched pairs did not agree with each other. Fewer supervisors (33%) than service workers (44%) reported the "supervisor or director" updated or maintained the central file, and fewer supervisors (11%) than service workers (30%) did not identify an individual who maintained and updated the central file. On the other hand, more supervisors (22%) than service workers (11%) identified the "service worker" as the person who updated and maintained the file. The remaining number of supervisors and service workers identified either the "social worker and director," "all staff," or "other." In response to this item, 11 (41%) of 27 pairs did not agree with each other. (Tables B51 and B52)

More than half of both supervisors and service workers indicated that there was a consistent method for making community agencies aware of their day care services. The remaining supervisors and service workers reported "no method" or left the item blank. Discrepancies were found in 33% of the matched pairs. Of those reporting there was a consistent method to keep community agencies informed, supervisors generally reported it was done "bi-annually," while, service workers reported it was done "periodically." (Tables B53 and B54)

The findings from these four tables suggest that there tended to be differences in perceptions as to whether or not a community resource file was available in the unit, whether a specific person was assigned to update and maintain the file, whether there was a method for updating information about the community agencies, and whether there was a consistent frequency by which the file was updated and maintained.

Central Community Agency File

Respondents were also requested to identify up to ten community agencies to which service workers frequently referred families for services, and the purpose for the referral. These responses were then categorized by the purpose of the referral. About 50% of both supervisors and service workers identified community resources for "health care." About 10% of the responses were categorized as agencies to which people were referred for "food stamps, medical assistance, or public assistance," and another 10% for "family counseling." The remaining percentages of responses for each "referral purpose" tended to be much less than 10%. Both supervisors and service workers showed the same response patterns as were found under the "total response." The data suggest that the purpose of referrals is primarily directed toward the family's health care. (Table B55)

One of every two supervisors and two of every five service workers reported that there was a "written agency policy" requiring the service worker to be in contact with an eligible family, while one of every two supervisors and three of every five service workers reported "no written policy existed." Of those reporting that minimum contacts were required, most supervisors and service workers reported that the required frequency was "monthly" visits, and another large proportion said they contacted families "twice a year." The purpose of these contacts was generally to discuss the "child's evaluation or progress" and to "assess the home environment." The findings show that for about half of the units a policy existed requiring the service worker to be in contact with a family a minimum number of times a year. For a quarter of the units this would be "monthly," and for another quarter it would be "semi-annually." The topics to be discussed during mandated contacts with a family were similar. (Tables B56 to B58)

Follow-up Services to Families

When a family failed to follow through on a referral made by a service worker, both supervisors and service workers reported that service workers would generally "call the family in and discuss the situation," then arrange a second appointment for the family. A "home visit" may be made before "re-arranging a second appointment" but more frequently this was done after "re-arranging a second appointment." If the family failed to act upon the second appointment, the service worker would then tend to "take the family to the referred agency." It appeared generally that service workers would make two efforts prior to "taking a family to a community agency" in order for the family to receive needed services, but further efforts would be made in only half of the units. (Tables B59)

The findings from Table B59 show the supervisors and service workers in agreement; however, inconsistencies within units were evident in the matched pair responses. Fifty-nine percent of the respondents in matched pairs disagreed in what they ranked first, 74% disagreed in what they ranked second, 67% disagreed in what they ranked third, and 30% disagreed in what they ranked fourth. The lack of agreement within each matched pair suggested that the "order" of the service worker's effort is not clearly established by the agency. Also, it suggested that each worker may have the discretion to determine how much effort should be made in order to provide services to the families.

If services to a family were terminated (in terms of day care), about two-thirds of both supervisors and service workers reported that follow-up services were provided to the families. For those units providing follow-up services, respondents reported the nature of the services to be "referral and counseling" "physical or mental health," "home visits," or "placement in day care or a school" services. However, 20 (74%) of the 27 matched pairs were inconsistent with each other. This seemed to indicate that the respondents were not sure whether follow-up services were provided, but agreed on the nature of the kinds of follow-up services available to families terminated from day care. (Table B60 and B61)

Finally, 89% of the supervisors and 96% of the service workers reported that service workers participated in parent involvement activities. Of those reporting that service workers participated in parent activities, <u>all service workers</u> reported that the social service worker made the "initial contact with the family to describe how parents are involved in the agency's

parent activities" and "contacted or notified the parents of ongoing parent activities." Service workers also reported that service workers "recruited parents into an active role in the parent program" (96%) "sustained parent's interest in the program" (92%), and "supervised parent activities" (58%); supervisors responses were similar. Generally, service workers reported more frequently than supervisors that they participated from the "initial contact" through the "sustaining parents' interest" stage with respect to parent participation. Only 7% of the matched pairs did not agree. (Tables B52 and B63)

Services to and Concern of Families

In concluding the presentation of findings, a brief summary of the important services identified by the respondents, common family needs, and some problem areas relating to the agency's policies and operations seem in order. Since two of these three questions were also addressed to all respondents who participated in the first part of the study (focusing upon the description of personnel and functions of the social service component) this provides an opportunity to compare the data from the two parts of the study.

Respondents were asked to list the <u>three most important services provided by their component</u>. The 173 responses were classified into 14 categories. The service workers listed "information and referral" (67%), "counseling" (63%), "health services" (26%), "parent training or parent activities" (26%) most often. Supervisors listed "counseling" (59%), "information and referral" (48%), and "support services" (37%) most often. Other services identified frequently were: "liaison between agency and family," "liaison between agency, community agencies, and family," and "professional skills." The "Other" category was a collection of many

different and infrequent responses. (Table B64)

In the first report, respondents had identified the three major services as "information and referral," "counseling," and "parent activities including parent training." Considering the two sets of data, it would appear that "information and referral" and "counseling" were the key services provided through the Social Services Component, and that "health services," "parent activities and parent training," and "support services" were dependent upon the nature of the agency or the setting in which the worker was employed.

Respondents were also requested to name common family problems. The 277 responses were classified into 16 categories. Service workers emphasized "child rearing/guidance" (63%), "marital/divorce/separation" (59%), and "physical health" (41%). On the other hand, supervisors reported "physical health" (52%), "child rearing/guidance" (48%), and "marital/divorce/separation" (41%) most. Thus, even though the proportions of responses varied, there was agreement on the same three common family problems. Further, if "mental health" and "physical health" categories had been combined (as they were for the first report), the area of "health" would have been the highest ranking problem identified by all respondents. (Table B65)

In comparing these findings with those identified in the first report (on personnel profiles), it is possible to arrive at a synthesis of problems and services critical to day care social service workers. In the first report, prevalant service areas were identified as "Employment/Training," "Health Services (screening)," "Marital/Divorce/Separation," "Housing," "School Placement," and "Child Guidance" (the last two were tied in rank).

Since there is overlap between the three major family problems and the major service areas, a list combining the top three responses of both the survey and interview data would show the problems encountered and the services provided by most social service workers to be as follows:

1. Child rearing problems are responded to by guidance counseling.
2. Health problems are responded to by screening, referral, and maintaining health records.
3. Marital/divorce/separation problems are responded to by family counseling.
4. Employment/training needs are responded to through employment counseling and referral.

Social Service Workers' Problems

Finally, respondents were asked to identify the problems which the workers in the Social Services Component encountered in relation to the agency's policies and operations. Eleven percent of the service workers and 4% of the supervisors reported no problems. For the remaining, the service workers identified "lack of support or acceptance from agency staff" (37%), "role clarification" (33%), and "increasing or overwhelming paperwork" (19%). The supervisors identified "role clarification" (33%), "lack of support or acceptance from agency staff" (26%), "increasing or overwhelming paperwork" (15%), "viewed as disciplinarian" (15%), and "difficulty keeping pace with policy changes" (15%). (Other problems identified may be found in Table B66.)

Even though the relative frequencies with which problems were named differed between the supervisors and service workers, the data show that "role clarification," "overwhelming or increasing paperwork," and "lack of support or acceptance from staff" were the <u>three</u> major problem areas faced by the workers in the component.

Respondents' Additional Comments

Before closing the discussion of the findings, it is important to note some comments which were shared with the interviewers and written on the questionnaires about one-third of those interviewed expressed some additional thoughts. Without exception, the most common response to the questionnaire was that it was too lengthy or time consuming. As a result, further undertakings for descriptive information should be focused on more specific areas. Some people commented that the questionnaire did not reveal the nature of multipurpose programs, and the questions were too structured (hence, they were insensitive to other roles social service workers may carry out). Some of the respondents indicated the questions were repetitious, some answers self evident, and some not applicable especially to the school-age and specialized agencies. Several respondents raised objections to the underlying assumptions of some of the questions. Some respondents reported that they (themselves) were too far removed from the activity to provide accurate responses.

Comments were also received that it was a "good questionnaire," the items helped respondents to reassess some of their own actions, and it provided them with a different perspective for reviewing their component.

Summary

A. Setting of the Social Services Component

1. Of the 35 Title IV-A agencies, 33 agencies cooperated in this descriptive study. Both supervisors' and social service workers' responses were obtained for 27 of 48 possible social service units. Thirteen "single" responses were also obtained.

2. Agencies typically employed between 11-20 personnel and on the average had one or two social service staff (about 1 of every 10 agency personnel is a social service worker).

3. Less than half of the units employed social service assistants or aides.

4. Almost half of the social workers reported to the director of the agency, the center, or the program. The remainder reported to either the social service supervisor or to both the social service supervisor and director.

5. Generally, an assistant/aide reported to a social worker.

6. It was not uncommon for other agency staff to be involved in doing some of the work of the social services component.

7. Volunteers were seldom used.

8. When the social service worker was absent, the director/assistant director, or other non-supervisory social service worker did the social service workers' task.

B. Intake and Admission

1. Parents and a social worker were required to be present at intake.

2. Family background information and child's health and developmental history were usually required for eligibility determination.

3. Information given to parents at intake consisted of a description of the agency's program, services, and policies and rules of the agency.

4. Information given to parents was not often written down, but was discussed verbally. (Hence most parents would have no information in writing for future reference.)

5. Explanation of program, service, and policies were discussed with the family before the family was admitted to day care.

6. More than one-third to one-half of the units did not use or need to use a waiting list.

7. Of those units which had a waiting list, supervisors and social service workers did not agree whether program, services, and policies were discussed prior to or after placing the family on a waiting list.

8. About half of the social service units did not determine (estimate) probable eligibility. Of the half with determined probable eligibility, it was determined prior to placing the family on a waiting list.

9. Generally, the family made only one visit to the day care agency before being admitted. In some cases two visits were required.

C. Ineligibility for Day Care Services

1. Approximately half of the social service units would inquire as to the family's desire to appeal the decision of ineligibility.

2. Appeals had occurred in less than one of seven units.

3. More than half of the units would help parents by referring them to other types of community programs.

4. More than half of the units would help parents by referring them to other (non-Title IV-A) day care agencies.

D. Priority For Admitting Families Who Are Eligible For Services

1. The major priority for admission, excluding CAO's criteria, was "date of application." This was followed by "child with multiple psychological problems" (this might occur primarily with specialized day care agencies).

2. Two-thirds of the units indicated that service workers had the authority to admit a family into day care, and of these, almost all consulted others before granting admission.

3. In contrast, more than three-fourths of the units reported that service workers did not have the authority to terminate services to a family.

4. Other than "child's age," "parent's request for termination of services," and "ineligibility based upon CAO's criteria," the possible reasons for termination would be the "child's excessive absence," "severe disablement or chronic illness," and the "lack of parent's cooperation in the program or a disruptive parent."

5. Service workers often determine the date, and time the child began day care, and the care group to which the child was assigned.

E. Professional Growth and Development

1. One-fifth of the service workers were promoted within the past year.

2. About three-fourths of the service units provided orientation to new social service employees.

3. More than half the units indicated that internal staff training was provided and focused on "techniques for working with parents."

4. Between three-fourths to four-fifths of the units indicated that staff engaged in external training programs. These training programs were generally offerred by "Day Care Services" or by "professional groups."

5. Other means of staff development were "journals and professional literature" or use of "consultants."

6. Usually the social service staff would receive "release time with pay" to support staff training.

F. Criteria for Determining Workload

1. The median number of families per unit was between 51-60 families.

2. The general "formulae" for determining the workload were:

a) The social service worker handled all families in the agency where only one worker was employed.

b) In situations where more than one social service worker was employed, the workers split the load evenly.

3. The median percentage of families in need of additional services beyond day care placement was 60-69% of each worker's caseload.

4. Three-fourths of the units reported that a service plan was developed for a family in need of services beyond day care placement.
   a) Whether a service plan was developed in a verbal or written (or a combination of the two) mode was not clear, since respondents did not agree with each other.
   b) Less than one-fifth indicated a complete development of a four step plan.
   c) Generally, respondents reported service plans were developed by the professional staff alone.
   d) Almost always, service plans were discussed with the parents and used by the social service staff and other agency staff.

5. "Physical health," "child rearing and child guidance," and "marital /separation/divorce" were the common family problems identified by the respondents as those which were most often brought to the service workers' attention.

6. "Counseling," "information and referrals," and "supportive services" were the most important services of the unit identified by the respondents.

7. About four-fifths of the units had a central file of community agencies available in the agency. The worker, director, or social service supervisor were individuals identified as the ones responsible for updating and maintaining the file.

8. Half of the respondents indicated that they had a consistent method for informing other agencies about their day care programs.

9. Families were referred most frequently to "health agencies" (about 50% of all types of agencies named were health agencies) and next most often (10%) to "CAO/DPW" and "community social agencies."

10. If a family did not follow through with a referral made by a service worker, it was generally the policy of the unit for the service worker to call the family in for a conference and then re-arrange a second appointment. If the second appointment was not kept, the social service worker tended to take the family to the agency.

11. About half of the units had written policies which required the service worker to be in contact with the family during the year (either monthly or semi-annually).

12. In two-thirds of the units, if day care services were terminated, the family would still be offered other services through follow-up work.

13. In about nine-tenths of the social service units, service workers were responsible for contacting parents and explaining parent involvement activities, informing parents of the parent activities, recruiting parents for activities, and sustaining parents' interest in the program.

14. Problem Areas:

a. The major problem area was the need for the clarification of the service workers' role in the agency.

b. The second major problem area was the lack of support from other agency staff members.

c. Other problem areas identified were:

(1) the overwhelming increase in the amount of paper work

(2) keeping pace with internal and external policy changes

(3) philosophical differences between the service worker and other agency staff members

(4) personnel policies of the unit (such as hours, salary, and supervision by a non-social service staff person)

ADDENDUM PATTERNS

Responses Across All Major Issues:

1. Matched pair responses for 23 items in the interview showed the following pattern of discrepancies between supervisors and service workers:

a) 0-20% discrepancies = 3 items (acceptable level of agreement)

b) 21-40% discrepancies = 6 items (non-acceptable level of agreement)

c) 41-60% discrepancies =10 items(non-acceptable level of agreement)

d) 61-80% discrepancies = 3 items (non-acceptable level of agreement)

e) 81-100% discrepancies = 1 item (non-acceptable level of agreement)

2. There were many discrepancies in responding to factual statements and in interpreting work, policies, and procedures within each unit. Supervisors and service workers did not agree in their perceptions of the component for one-third of the items they were asked.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

According to the Title 4600, Department of Public Welfare Regulations and the Proposal Guidelines for Title IV-A Day Care Programs of January 16, 1974, social casework must be available to families in day care programs, and the social service worker is to act in the role of family advocate by obtaining services for the family and by referring families to the appropriate community agencies. The service worker is to be a graduate of a four-year college or university. The duties include: conducting intake studies, assisting parents in selecting an appropriate day care center, helping parents prepare the child for day care, maintaining regular contacts with the family to discuss the child's progress, keeping the internal staff abreast of the child's and parents' use of the program, and maintaining the child's and family's case records. An aide may be hired to assist the caseworker in these tasks.

It may be concluded from the general description of the social services component that the functions and services of the component are at least perceived by service workers and supervisors to be the same as stipulated by the Department of Public Welfare. However, it is useful to go beyond this generalization and to highlight selected issues for further consideration.

For 32 agencies (and their units), the structure of the Social Service Component is "simple," while for three large agencies (14 units) it is "complex." That is, for most social service units there is only one staff person, and "she" reports to the director. There is neither a middle management position nor a professional supervisor position. The director

is usually the worker's supervisor, and may or may not be trained or be experienced in social casework. Yet, the director may find it necessary from time to time to take over the duties of the service worker during absences (illness or vacation). It becomes evident in the course of this report that full understanding or agreement has not been achieved on about one third of the issues concerning the functions and services of the social service component, as evidenced by the number of times that two people from the same unit did not agree in their answers to questions. This problem may be due to an inadequacy in the lines of communication between supervisor and worker, but it may also be that the service worker in very many situations does her job essentially unsupervised and according to an individualized conceptualization of the component.

In another area, the regulations, as implemented, have made the social service worker the major intermediary between the day care program and the adult members of the client-family (the caregiver cares for the child only on a daily basis). Unless the agency has carefully defined the relationship between parent, service worker, caregiver, and child, and regularly stresses these relationships to all staff, the social service worker may well be the only staff member who must consider day care in the larger context of the family's social problems, immediate adult problems, and long term family goals. Thus, the worker will be relegated to a different "world" from the rest of the staff and consequently be isolated in perception. That this may in fact be the case is indicated by the respondents' identification of one major problem of the social service worker as the "lack of staff support." Other staff (at least caregivers) have colleagues from the same "world" on the job with whom to talk and share concerns, but a service

worker may often be alone both because of lack of immediate colleagues and the demands of her job.

The study also showed that there were a variety of functions identified by the service workers. These included the following: "processor of forms" (from intake through termination of services), "enforcer of policies" (such as trying to keep absences to a minimum), "coordinator," "counselor," "enabler," "advocate," "liaison," "interpreter" (of policies), "recruiter" (for day care and parent activities), "organizer" (parent activities), "referrer," and "substitutor" (filling in during staff absences). The variety of functions went far beyond those listed in the regulations. In undertaking these functions, the service worker may experience some contradictions. For example, some social service workers have the authority to admit families and terminate services, and therefore it would seem logical for them also to enforce policies. However, in order to provide direct services, especially counselling, it is necessary that the social worker be regarded by the family as one providing assistance without any element of threat (that the service will be withdrawn, for example). There seems to be a built in conflict for the family that they would have to weigh the advantages of revealing all that is necessary to obtain a service against the possible consequences of revealing something that may terminate the services.

In still another area, both studies of the component in 1974-1975 (this one and the earlier examination of staff "profiles") reveal that, on the average social workers handle 31-40 families, and that assistants/aides are assigned 61-70 families. It was furthermore, reported that service workers provide additional services (other than day care placement) to a number of their families, the median percentage range of which was 60% to

69%. Further, service workers must do intake studies for families not assigned (prior to admission), and provide service to "inactive" families (after day care placement has been terminated). This may well explain why the average respondent in the "profile" study indicated that she worked one to five hours overtime per week.)

All of these points regarding the functions and the work load of the service workers appear to support not only the respondent's contention that a second major problem they face was the lack of a clear role definition, but that the assignment of work loads is not being judged in the light of all the actual demands being placed. That is, the service worker might be able to carry out the duties named in the regulations for a number of families, but hardly be able to do all of the functions expected even with all the active families assigned, much less with those who are not part of the regular case load.

Since, to take up a further point, service workers must focus so much of their attention upon diagnosing and advocating, it seems fair to say that their work is primarily a manipulation of environmental factors rather than a changing of attitudes, behaviors, or values. That this is the case seems to be supported by the small degree to which "service plans" were actually developed by service workers. The lack of planning may result in families receiving less continuity in <u>professional</u> services. In fact, there were two areas for which written information was generally not available, one being the lack of a service plan, and the other being the lack of printed information regarding programs, policies, and procedures. The effect of the former situation has been noted. It would seem that by not having the latter, adults would have difficulty making future references to policies,

programs and procedures, and accordingly may not follow through on a course of action simply because of this lack.

Finally, the services identified by respondents in this study again showed (as they did in the "profile" study) that information and referral and counseling were the key services. The primary focus of the referral services was on health care and basic survival (housing, food, etc.). Counseling services seemed to have been focused primarily upon child guidance, marriage/separation/divorce, and (from the profile study alone) employment. It would appear, then, that the service worker is providing a crucial link between the community resources and the needs of the families, and furthermore, that the needs of the families in day care are apparently not being met by any other individuals or social agencies.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE USED FOR THE DESCRIPTION OF THE STRUCTURE, FUNCTIONS, AND SERVICES OF THE TITLE IV-A SOCIAL SERVICES COMPONENT

Interviewer: _____
Date of Interview: _____

Instrument B
Endorsed 4/17/75

STRUCTURE, FUNCTIONS AND SERVICES OF THE TITLE IV-A SOCIAL SERVICES COMPONENT

Name of Agency: _____

Respondent's position title: _____

Agency is: ( ) Fee and Non-fee ( ) Non-fee only

****

A. Staffing & Training

*1. a) What is the total number of full-time paid positions in the agency? (Get Set, leave 1a. blank, go to 1b.) _____

b) How many positions exist under the social services component? (For Get Set specify "within your unit")

	Number of Positions	No. Vacant
social work supervisor	_____	_____
social worker	_____	_____
case assistants/aides	_____	_____
other (specify) _____	_____	_____

*2. a) To whom is each social service worker primarily accountable for his/her work responsibilities? (Indicate by position title only.)

_____

_____

b) Are there any other functions which the worker is accountable for under someone else?

( ) Yes ( ) No

If yes, please indicate position, function, and accountability.

Position	Function	Accountability
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

* See proposal for information. If information is unobtainable, please ask respondent.

c) Are non-social services paid personnel responsible for social services functions?

( ) Yes ( ) No

If yes, please elaborate on these service functions:

_____

_____

3. a) How would the social services worker's functions be handled in his/her absence of two or more weeks (e.g., vacation or sick leave)? Describe:

_____

_____

b) Has this occurred during the past six months? ( ) Yes ( ) No

4. On the average, how many families are each social service worker responsible for?

Total number of families served? _____

social worker _____ asst./aides _____ others _____

5. What general formula does the agency use to arrive at the number of families for which each level of social service's worker will be responsible?

_____

_____

6. Are the functions of assistants/aides different than the functions of social workers in your agency?

( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) Not applicable

If yes, in what ways do their jobs differ?

_____

_____

_____

7. Describe the supervision and on-the-job training of assistants/aides.

_____

_____

_____

8. a) Have any assistants/aides been promoted to the level of a social worker in the agency within the last 12 months?

( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) N/A

Please explain your response: _____

_____

b) Have any social workers been promoted to a higher level or another position within the last 12 months?

( ) Yes ( ) No

9. Are new social services employees given an orientation to your agency?

( ) Yes ( ) Sometimes ( ) No ( ) Not Applicable

10. Do you have staff training programs which are developed or sponsored by the agency for the social service staff?

( ) Yes ( ) No

If yes, what are the usual topics and how frequently are training programs held (e.g., once each month)?

	Topics	Frequency
(1)	_____	_____
(2)	_____	_____
(3)	_____	_____

11. Is your agency's social services staff now involved in any training programs offerred by other agencies?

( ) Yes ( ) No

If yes, please indicate provider, topic of training and number of staff attending.

Provider	Topic of Training	Number
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

12. Besides workshops and courses, by what other means does the agency provide for the professional growth for the social services employees?

(1) _____ (2) _____

13. In what way(s) is training subsidized by your agency? (Check the applicable items.)

____1) Release time (with pay)
____2) Release time (without pay)
____3) Stipend
____4) Partial payment (e.g., tuition & books)
____5) Other (specify)

14. Do volunteers (non-paid workers) help in the social services component?

( ) Yes ( ) No

If yes, what kinds of volunteers (e.g., students in field work, parents, church groups, grandparents) how many, and what tasks do they do?

	Volunteers	Number	Tasks
(1)	_____	_____	_____
(2)	_____	_____	_____
(3)	_____	_____	_____

15. What are some problem areas which the social services worker encounters in relating to agency policies or operations (e.g., roles, responsibilities, gaining support of other staff)?

(1) _____

(2) _____

(3) _____

B. Services, Service Plan, and Needs

1. List the three most important services provided by the component to families in day care.

(1) _____

(2) _____

(3) _____

2. What are some common kinds of family problems which the social worker is called upon to deal with?

(1) _____ (4) _____

(2) _____ (5) _____

(3) _____ (6) _____

3. a) What is the total percentage of families requesting or in need of supportive services (additional services) beyond day care placement? _____

b) Has an explicit service plan been developed for these families?

( ) Yes ( ) No

(1) If yes, complete (a) through (d).

(a) Is the service plan: ( ) ____on a written form
( ) ____unwritten but disucssed with the family

(b) How do you assess (cognitive process) the situation in order to resolve the service needs of the family?

(1) _____ (4) _____

(2) _____ (5) _____

(3) _____ (6) _____

(c) Who decides what should be included in the service plan?

_____

(d) Is the service plan? (check applicable items.)

____1) only discussed verbally with parents
____2) given to the parents
____3) for social worker's use only
____4) for social worker and staff use only
____5) other (specify) _____

(2) If no, what procedures are followed in these instances?

_____

_____

4. a) Is there a written agency policy regarding the minimum number of times the parents and social worker are in contact with each other (e.g., yearly or weekly) while the family receives services from the agency?

( ) Yes ( ) No

If yes, how often: _____

b) What is usually discussed during these contacts?

(1) _____ (3) _____

(2) _____ (4) _____

5. Does the social worker have responsibility for parent participation?

( ) Yes ( ) No

If yes, what is the worker's responsibility? (Check applicable items.)

____1) Initial contact to describe how the agency involves parents
____2) Contacting or notifying parents of activities
____3) Recruiting parents into taking an active role in program activities
____4) Sustaining parent interest in program activities
____5) Supervising parent activities
____6) Other (specify) _____

C. Intake, Admission, and Termination

1. We are interested in ascertaining the typical admission procedure for day care. The batch of 3 x 5 cards will be used to order the steps in the admission procedure of the agency.* Each 3 x 5 card has a step of the admission procedure. The cards are batched alphabetically with corresponding numbers on the top right hand corner. All cards do not have to be used. Additional blank cards may be used to fill in steps which are considered important to the agency in its admission procedure.

An example of a typical admission procedure may begin with:

a) Request for services
b) Family on waiting list
c) Initial family/child intake interview
d) .....

Please ask the respondent to: a) order the cards in relation to a family who is eligible and participates in the program, and b) order the cards in relation to when a family is ineligible by CBA and does not participate in the program under Title IV-A funding. Indicate by number, the procedure for an eligible and ineligible family in the space provided.

Eligible Nos. _____

_____

Ineligible Nos. _____

_____

*See attached sheet for list of steps used in the admission procedure.

2. a) Who may be involved during the intake interview? Indicate "R" for required, "P" for preferred, "A" for allowed, and "NA" for not allowed.

___1) Parent(s) or guardian(s)
___2) Child or children
___3) Referral source representative
___4) Other parent representative
___5) Director of Head teacher
___6) Caregiving staff person
___7) Social Services supervisor
___8) Social worker
___9) Case assistant/aide
___10) Other (specify) _____
_____

b) What information is collected from the parents at intake? (Check applicable items.)

___1) Need for day care
___2) Family/Social History
___3) Developmental History
___4) Demographic data (e.g., address)
___5) Employment status
___6) Emergency contacts
___7) Financial situation
___8) Parent's reaction to the center
___9) Parent's expectation of services
___10) Child's reaction to the center
___11) Escort arrangements
___12) Diagnosis of child's handicap
___13) Allergies and food preferences
___14) Record of medical history
___a) Immunizations
___b) Physical exam
___c) Dental care
___15) Child's functioning level according to parents
___a) Cognitive
___b) Behavior/Emotional
___c) Social Interaction
___d) Motor activity and perception
___16) Psychological screening
___17) Permission forms:
___a) Trips and release
___b) Medical & prescription
___18) Other (specify)
___a) _____
___b) _____
___c) _____

3. See next page.

4. After a family qualifies for day care by CBA, does the social worker have the authority to grant the family admission to the agency?

( ) Yes ( ) No

a) If yes, is anyone else consulted in the admission?

( ) Yes ( ) No

If yes, who are they? _____

b) If no, who participates in the decision to admit a child to the agency? (Indicate by position title only.)

_____

_____

3. What are the areas of discussion during the social worker's contact or contacts with the family before a child is admitted to day care. Place a check mark in each appropriate column to indicate whether or not the following items are discussed, discussed and written, or written. "No" indicates it is not discussed before admission. "NA" indicates it does not exist in the agency's program.

Explanation of agency's Day Care Program	Discussed	Discussed & Written	Written	No	N/A
Agency's program and services:					
Career Development					
Daily Activities					
Educational Programs					
Employment Opportunities					
Evaluation of the centers					
Evaluation of the child					
Health Program					
Nutrition Program					
Parent Organization					
Speech, language & hearing services					
Social Services					
Treatment Program					
Policies and rules of the Agency:					
Clothing					
Confidentiality of information					
Admission procedure					
Termination of services					
Eligibility requirements					
Fees					
Financial responsibilities					
Hours of care					
Medical condition of child					
Preplacement of child					
Responsibilities for meals					
Rights and responsibilities of the family					
Transportation and pick-up					
Other:					
Agency's goals and objectives					
Facilities					
Tour of the center					
Other (specify) _____					

5. Excluding the priorities established by CBA, what are the agency's major priorities for accepting a child into the program (e.g., date of application or equalizing the sex composition of the class)?

(1) _____ (3) _____

(2) _____ (4) _____

6. Who determines (1) the day the child is to begin attending, (2) the care group he/she will be in, and (3) the time at which the child is to first arrive?

(1) _____ (2) _____

(3) _____

7. a) If a family decides to appeal the agency's decision of non-admittance, does the agency assist the family in its efforts to help the family appeal?

( ) Yes ( ) No

If yes, how? _____

_____

b) Has this situation occurred since September 1974?

( ) Yes ( ) No

If yes, how many times? _____

8. Under what conditions might a family/child be terminated from the agency's program excluding ineligibility due to child's age, CBA's standards, and the family's request for termination of services?

(1) _____ (5) _____

(2) _____ (6) _____

(3) _____ (7) _____

(4) _____ (8) _____

9. Does the social worker have the authority to remove the child from the agency?

( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) Conditional

a) If conditional, under what conditions does the social worker remove the child from the agency (e.g., frequent absence)?

(1) _____ (4) _____

(2) _____ (5) _____

(3) _____ (6) _____

b) If no, who participates in the decision to remove the child from the agency? (Indicate by position title only.)

_____

_____

D. Referral & Follow-Up

1. Is there a central community resource file in your agency?

( ) Yes ( ) No

2. Who maintains and updates the community resource file?

Position: _____

3. Do you have a consistent method of making community agencies aware of your program and the social services your agency offers to families?

( ) Yes ( ) No

If yes, how often? _____

If yes, how are community agencies informed?

(1) _____ (3) _____

(2) _____ (4) _____

4. What follow-up services are regularly provided by the social services component? If none, write NONE.

(1) _____ (4) _____

(2) _____ (5) _____

(3) _____ (6) _____

5. a) Generally what actions are taken by the agency when the social services worker refers a family to a community resource (e.g., a resource name is given to the family to contact for service or the agency calls and arranges for an appointment) and the family fails to act on the agency's referral? Order the applicable items which represent what is generally undertaken.

___1) re-arrange a second appointment for the family
___2) home visit
___3) call in the family and discuss the situation
___4) take the family to the referred agency
___5) family must take their own initiative to contact the community resource (no action due to agency's philosophy)
___6) other (specify) _____

b) Does the above procedure vary depending on the situation?

( ) Yes ( ) No

If yes, under what kinds of situations?

(1) _____ (4) _____

(2) _____ (5) _____

(3) _____ (6) _____

6. See next page.

COMMENTS: Please specify which items the respondent told you were unclear. Also, please ask the respondent if they would like to add any pertinent information that may be of interest to us.

6. List the community resource agencies frequently used by the social services component. Indicate the purpose, primarily for which member of the family (e.g., child), referral policy in relation to method of referral (e.g., phone call), and position of the contact person of the receiving agency.

	Name of Resource Agency	Purpose of Use	Member Family	*Referral Policy	Position of Contact Person
Exp:	CBA	Family Planning	Parents	1	Intake Worker of FP Unit
(1)					
(2)					
(3)					
(4)					
(5)					
(6)					
(7)					
(8)					
(9)					
(10)					

78

*Referral Policy Column 4
Code: 1) = Telephone
2) = Verbally inform family of resource
3) = Letter or written referral form
4) = Take client to community resource
5) = Other (specify) _____

79

UPON COMPLETION PLEASE RETURN TO PREVIOUS PAGE

ALPHABETICAL LISTING OF POSSIBLE STEPS IN THE ADMISSION PROCEDURE

1) Agency's decision whether or not to admit the family
2) Application set to CBA
3) CBA's decision of eligibility
4) CBA's decision of ineligibility
5) Child admitted---paper
6) Child enrolled--physically in the center
7) Child has pre-placement
   Parent accompanies child to center on the first day and remains with the child until the child has adjusted to the new situation.
8) Decision whether or not the family will be placed on a waiting list
9) Determine whether or not family wishes to appeal decision
10) Explanation of agency's services and policies
11) Family is notified of eligibility
12) Family is notified of ineligibility
13) Family referred to community agency
14) Initial family and/or child visit for intake interview
15) 2nd Family and/or child visit
16) 3rd Family and/or child visit
17) Medical & Health forms received from proper medical agency
18) Preliminary information taken
19) Probable eligibility determined by social worker or others
20) Referral to another day care center or information given to another center
21) Request for services
22) Request for special records (e.g., psychological)
23) Tour of center
24) Blank card
25) Blank card

APPENDIX B

TABLES OF 66 CHARACTERISTICS OF THE DESCRIPTION OF THE STRUCTURE, FUNCTIONS, AND SERVICES OF THE TITLE IV-A SOCIAL SERVICES COMPONENT IN PHILADELPHIA 1974-1975

TABLE B1

ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PERSONNEL AND
RATIO OF SERVICE WORKERS TO THE TOTAL
PERSONNEL OF AN AGENCY

Range in Numbers Of Agency Total Staff	Agencies		Estimated Ratio of Service Workers To Total Agency's Staff			
	Number	Percentage	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency
1-10	4	11%	1:3	1	1:12	2
11-15	8	23%	1:4	3	1:13	1
16-20	9	26%	1:5	2	1:14	3
21-25	3	8%	1:6	-	1:15	1
26-30	2	6%	1:7	2	1:16	-
31-35	1	3%	1:8	2	1:17	-
36 plus	6	17%	1:9	6	1:18	4
Blank/Other	2	6%	1:10	5	Un-	
			1:11	2	spec-	1
Total	35	100%			ified	

TABLE B2

ESTIMATED NUMBER OF SOCIAL SERVICE STAFF
POSITIONS BETWEEN JULY 31, 1975 - AUGUST 26, 1975
IN TITLE IV-A DAY CARE

Position	No. of Positions	No of Vacant Positions
Social Services Supervisor including Unit Leader and Co-ordinator	25	4
Social Worker	81	4
Assistant/Aides	84	6
Other	11	0
Total	201	14

TABLE B3

FREQUENCY AT WHICH ASSISTANT/AIDE'S AND SOCIAL WORKER'S FUNCTIONS DIFFER

Functions Differ	Dual Response**				Total Response			
	Supervisor N=27		Service Worker N=27		Supervisor N=37		Service Worker N=30	
	Number	Percentage*	Number	Percentage*	Number	Percentage*	Number	Percentage
Yes	5	19%	8	30%	6	16%	10	33%
No	8	30%	8	30%	12	32%	8	27%
Not Applicable	14	52%	11	41%	19	51%	12	40%
Total	27	99%	27	101%	37	99%	30	100%

B-2

*Total percentage may not equal 100% because individual percentages have been rounded off.

**Dual Responses were not in agreement for 10 of 27 pairs (37%).

TABLE B4

DIFFERENCE IN FUNCTIONS OF ASSISTANTS/AIDES AND SOCIAL WORKERS

Social Worker Does: *	Dual Response		Total Response	
	Supervisor N=5	Service Worker N=8	Supervisor N=6	Service Worker N=10
More Counseling	1	4	2	5
Supervision and Management	2	2	3	3
Less Health Related Work	2	2	2	2
Less Paper Work	0	3	0	3
Greater Caseload	0	2	0	2
More Work with Parents	2	0	2	0
Have Ultimate Responsibility	0	1	0	2

*Multiple responses were accepted.

TABLE B5

FREQUENCY OF DIFFERENT CHAINS OF COMMAND
IN THE SOCIAL SERVICES COMPONENT

Types of Chains of Command	Dual Response				Total Response			
	Supervisor		Service Worker		Supervisor		Service Worker	
	Number	Percentage*	Number	Percentage*	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Social Worker to Director	10	37%	11	41%	15	41%	12	40%
Social Worker to Social Service Supervisor	6	27%	4	15%	7	19%	5	17%
Social Worker or Aide to Director and Professional Supervisor	3	11%	4	15%	5	14%	4	13%
Aide to Social Worker to Director	4	15%	5	19%	6	16%	6	20%
Aide to Social Worker to Social Service Supervisor	2	7%	0	0%	2	5%	0	0%
Other	2	7%	3	11%	2	5%	3	10%
Total	27	99%	27	101%	37	100%	30	100%

TABLE B6

FREQUENCY WITH WHICH SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS ARE ACCOUNTABLE OUTSIDE THE NORMAL CHAIN OF COMMAND

Response	Dual Response**				Total Response			
	Supervisor		Service Worker		Supervisor		Service Worker	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Outside the Normal Chain of Command	7	26%	7	26%	9	24%	8	27%
Normal Chain of Command Only	20	74%	20	74%	28	76%	22	73%
Total	27	100%	27	100%	37	100%	30	100%

**Dual Responses were not in agreement for 10 of 27 pairs (37%).

TABLE B7

FUNCTIONS FOR WHICH SOCIAL SERVICES IS ACCOUNTABLE OUTSIDE THE NORMAL CHAIN OF COMMAND

Function	Accountability	Frequency
Attendance	Day Care Services	5
Eligibility	Day Care Services	2
Parent Activities	Director (agency/center)	2
Health Records	Director (agency/center)	3
Time Sheets	Director (agency/center)	4
Developing Health or Center's Policies	Board of Director	1
Consultation for Emotionally Disturbed Children	Supervisor of Education	1
Placement of Child	Director (agency/center)	1
Blank		2

TABLE B8

THE NUMBER OF NON-SOCIAL SERVICES
PERSONNEL RESPONSIBLE FOR SOCIAL SERVICE FUNCTIONS

Response	Dual Response				Total Response			
	Supervisor		Service Worker		Supervisor		Service Worker	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Other Personnel Responsible for Social Services	18	66%	16	59%	22	59%	16	53%
Social Services Personnel Responsible	8	30%	11	41%	14	38%	14	47%
Blank	1	4%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%
Total	27	100%	27	100%	37	100%	30	100%

TABLE B9

THE NUMBER OF VOLUNTEERS PARTICIPATING
IN SOCIAL SERVICES COMPONENT

Volunteers Do Participate	Dual Response				Total Response			
	Supervisor		Service Worker		Supervisor		Service Worker	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Yes	8	30%	10	37%	12	32%	10	33%
No	19	70%	17	63%	25	68%	20	67%
Total	27	100%	27	100%	37	100%	30	100%

TABLE B10

TYPES OF VOLUNTEERS
PARTICIPATING IN THE SOCIAL SERVICES COMPONENT

Types of Volunteer	Dual Response		Total Response	
	Supervisor N=10	Service Worker N=13	Supervisor N=13	Service Worker N=13
	Number	Number	Number	Number
Students (college)	6	6	9	6
Parents	3	5	3	5
Trained Volunteers of the Agency	0	1	0	1
Community Volunteers	1	1	1	1
Unspecified	0	0	1	0

TABLE B11

NUMBER OF VOLUNTEERS FOR A SOCIAL SERVICES UNIT

Number of Volunteers	Dual Response		Total Response	
	Supervisor N=10	Service Worker N=12	Supervisor N=15	Service Worker N=12
	Number	Number	Number	Number
1	5	5	6	5
2	1	3	2	4
3-4	1	1	2	1
5-10	1	1	1	1
11-15	0	1	0	1
16-20	0	1	0	1
Unspecified	2	0	3	0

TABLE B12

SUBSTITUTION FOR WORKER WAS NECESSARY
BETWEEN MARCH AND AUGUST, 1975

Substitution Has Occurred	Dual Response				Total Response			
	Supervisor		Service Worker		Supervisor		Service Worker	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Yes	17	63%	11	41%	25	68%	12	40%
No	10	37%	16	59%	11	29%	18	60%
Blank	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%
Total	27	100%	27	100%	37	100%	30	100%

TABLE B13

INDIVIDUALS RESPONSIBLE
FOR SOCIAL WORKER'S FUNCTIONS
DURING ABSENCES

Individual(s) Responsible**	Dual Response				Total Response			
	Supervisor N=27		Service Worker N=27		Supervisor N=37		Service Worker N=30	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Director or Assistant Director	12	44%	8	30%	18	49%	9	30%
Other Social Service Staff	7	26%	12	44%	8	22%	13	43%
Supervisor	7	26%	4	15%	8	22%	5	17%
Caregiver/ teacher	2	7%	1	4%	4	11%	1	3%
Secretary	0	0%	2	7%	1	3%	2	7%
Other Professional (psychologist)	2	7%	1	4%	2	5%	1	3%
No one	2	7%	1	4%	4	11%	1	3%
Not known/ Has not occurred	0	0%	2	7%	0	0%	2	7%

**Multiple Responses were accepted.

TABLE B14

PERSONS INVOLVED DURING INTAKE

Individuals Identified	Dual Responses										Total Responses									
	Supervisor					Service Worker					Supervisor					Service Worker				
	R	P	A	NA	B	R	P	A	NA	B	R	P	A	NA	B	R	P	A	NA	B
Parents	26	0	1	0	0	24	3	0	0	0	36	0	1	0	0	27	3	0	0	0
Child	9	9	6	3	0	7	8	9	3	0	13	11	8	5	0	7	9	10	4	0
Referral Source Representative	0	3	18	5	1	0	3	21	2	1	0	5	22	7	3	0	3	23	2	2
Other Parent Representative	2	2	17	6	0	2	0	17	8	0	2	2	23	9	1	2	0	19	8	1
Director or Head Teacher	0	4	17	3	3	2	0	16	8	1	1	4	24	5	3	2	0	17	10	1
Caregiving Staff	1	0	10	11	5	0	2	12	11	2	2	0	13	17	5	0	2	13	13	2
Social Services Supervisor	0	0	12	1	14	0	1	10	7	9	1	0	14	1	21	0	1	11	8	10
Social Worker	26	0	1	0	0	26	1	0	0	0	33	0	2	0	2	29	1	0	0	0
Assistant/Aide	2	2	4	2	17	3	1	6	1	16	5	2	6	3	21	3	1	7	2	17
Other (music, interpretor, admin. asst., psychologist, student)	2	1	4	0	20	5	0	2	0	20	3	2	4	0	28	5	0	2	0	23

R= Required
P= Preferred
A= Allowed
NA= Not Allowed
B = Blank

TABLE B15-A

INFORMATION AND POLICIES DISCUSSED BY SERVICE WORKERS WITH FAMILY BEFORE ADMITTING CHILD TO DAY CARE

Areas Of Discussion	Dual Response								Total Response							
	Supervisor				Service Worker				Supervisor				Service Worker			
	Discussed	Discussed and Written	Written	Not Applicable	Discussed	Discussed and Written	Written	Not Applicable	Discussed	Discussed and Written	Written	Not Applicable	Discussed	Discussed and Written	Written	Not Applicable
Agency's Program and Services																
Career Development for parent	14	0	0	13	19	3	0	5	18	1	0	18	20	4	0	6
Daily Activities for child	12	14	0	1	19	8	0	0	16	19	0	2	20	9	0	1
Education Programs for child	16	11	0	0	18	7	0	2	19	17	0	1	20	8	0	2
Employment Opportunities for parent in center	13	0	0	14	12	2	1	12	21	0	0	16	14	2	1	13
Evaluation of centers	15	0	0	12	13	0	0	14	20	1	0	16	13	1	0	16
Evaluation of child	20	4	0	3	14	7	0	6	25	6	0	6	16	8	0	6
Health Program of the center	17	7	1	2	15	10	0	2	21	12	1	3	16	11	0	3
Nutrition program of the center	16	8	1	2	15	9	0	3	21	12	1	3	16	20	0	4
Parent organization of the center	20	7	0	0	18	8	1	0	25	12	0	0	20	9	1	0
Speech, language, hearing services of the center	21	2	1	3	23	2	0	2	26	6	1	4	24	2	0	4
Social Services of the center	19	7	0	1	21	6	0	0	24	10	0	3	23	7	0	0
Treatment program for the child	10	1	0	16	11	2	0	14	13	4	0	20	12	2	0	16

TABLE B15-B

INFORMATION AND POLICIES DISCUSSED BY SERVICE WORKERS WITH FAMILY BEFORE ADMITTING CHILD TO DAY CARE

Areas of Discussion	Dual Responses								Total Responses							
	Supervisor				Service Worker				Supervisor				Service Worker			
	Discussed	Discussed and Written	Written	Not Applicable	Discussed	Discussed and Written	Written	Not Applicable	Discussed	Discussed and Written	Written	Not Applicable	Discussed	Discussed and Written	Written	Not Applicable
Policies and Rules of the Agency																
Clothing	13	13	0	1	9	13	2	3	18	17	0	2	9	14	2	5
Confidentiality of information	18	7	1	1	22	5	0	0	24	11	1	1	23	5	0	2
Admission Procedure	19	7	0	1	19	8	0	0	25	11	0	1	22	8	0	0
Termination of Services	15	5	1	6	16	6	1	4	20	6	1	10	17	8	1	4
Eligibility Requirements	15	12	0	0	18	8	0	1	19	15	0	3	20	9	0	1
Fees	5	4	0	18	5	3	0	19	7	4	0	26	5	3	0	22
Financial Responsibilities	6	5	0	16	5	5	0	17	8	5	0	24	5	5	0	20
Hours of Care	12	14	0	1	13	14	0	0	18	28	0	1	15	15	0	0
Medical Condition of the child	15	12	0	0	15	11	0	1	19	15	0	3	18	11	0	1
Preplacement of the child	17	8	0	2	18	6	0	3	24	9	0	4	20	6	1	3
Responsibilities for meals	18	7	0	2	18	6	1	2	24	0	0	4	19	6	2	3
Rights and responsibilities of the family	16	11	0	0	16	11	0	0	23	13	0	1	19	11	0	0
Transportation and pick-up	16	8	0	3	11	6	0	10	18	10	6	4	11	6	0	12
Other																
Agency's goals and objectives	19	7	0	1	16	6	2	4	24	11	0	2	18	6	2	4
Facilities	21	5	0	1	24	3	0	0	28	7	0	2	27	3	0	0
Tour of the center (conducted)	27	0	0	0	23	2	0	2	37	0	0	0	26	2	0	2

TABLE B16

WHEN FAMILY IS INFORMED OF AGENCY'S SERVICES AND POLICIES
IN RELATION TO CHILD'S ADMISSION TO DAY CARE

Explanation Of Agencies Services and Policies	Dual Response				Total Responses			
	Supervisor		Service Worker		Supervisor		Service Worker	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage *	Number	Percentage*	Number	Percentage
Information shared before family admitted	20	74%	21	77%	29	78%	23	77%
Information shared after family admitted	1	4%	2	7%	2	5%	2	7%
No information shared or family admitted procedure was not identified	4	15%	3	11%	4	11%	4	13%
Blank	2	7%	1	4%	2	5%	1	3%
Total	27	100%	27	99%	37	99%	30	100%

*Total percentage does not equal 100% because individual percentages were rounded off to the nearest whole number.

TABLE B17

WHEN FAMILY IS INFORMED OF AGENCY'S SERVICES AND POLICIES
IN RELATION TO FAMILY'S PLACEMENT ON A WAITING LIST

Explanation of Agency's Services and Policies	Dual Response				Total Response			
	Supervisor		Service Worker		Supervisor		Service Worker	
	Number	Percentage*	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage*	Number	Percentage
Information shared before family placed on waiting list	13	48%	7	26%	16	43%	9	30%
Information shared after family placed on waiting list	2	7%	7	26%	6	16%	8	27%
No information shared or Placed on waiting list procedure was not identified	10	37%	12	44%	13	35%	12	40%
Blank	2	7%	1	4%	2	5%	1	3%
Total	27	99%	27	100%	37	99%	30	100%

*Total does not equal 100% because individual percentages have been rounded off to the nearest whole number.

B-14

TABLE B18

WHEN PROBABLE ELIGIBILITY IS DETERMINED IN
RELATION TO FAMILY'S PLACEMENT ON A WAITING LIST

Point When Probable Eligibility Determined	Dual Responses				Total Responses			
	Supervisor		Service Worker		Supervisor		Service Worker	
	Number	Percentage *	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Before Placement on waiting list	12	44%	8	30%	19	51%	9	30%
After Placement on waiting list	1	4%	5	18%	1	3%	6	20%
No probable eligibility or waiting list procedure identified	12	44%	13	48%	15	41%	14	47%
Blank	2	7%	1	4%	2	5%	1	3%
Total	27	99%	27	100%	37	100%	30	100%

*Total does not equal 100% because individual percentages were rounded off to the nearest whole number

TABLE B19

NUMBER OF FAMILY VISITS TO THE AGENCY
BEFORE A FAMILY IS ADMITTED TO DAY CARE

	Dual Response				Total Responses			
	Supervisor		Service Worker		Supervisor		Service Worker	
Number of Visits	Number	Percentage*	Number	Percentage *	Number	Percentage*	Number	Percentage*
One	12	44%	17	63%	17	46%	18	60%
Two	6	22%	4	15%	9	24%	5	17%
Three	2	7%	2	7%	3	8%	2	7%
Blank Card (indicating family visits or family admitted not identified)	7	26%	4	15%	8	21%	5	17%
Total	27	99%	27	99%	37	99%	30	101%

*Total does not equal 100% because individual percentages were rounded off to the nearest whole number.

B-16

TABLE B20

NUMBER OF SOCIAL SERVICE UNITS WHICH ASSIST A FAMILY TO APPEAL THE COUNTY BOARD OF ASSISTANCE'S RULING ON ELIGIBILITY OF FAMILY

	Dual Response				Total Responses			
	Supervisor		Service Worker		Supervisor		Service Worker	
Assistance In Appeal	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage *	Number	Percentage*	Number	Percentage
Agency Assists	14	52%	11	41%	22	59%	12	40%
Agency does not assist	6	22%	8	30%	7	19%	8	27%
Don't Know	1	4%	3	11%	2	5%	3	10%
NA/fee program	6	22%	5	19%	6	16%	7	23%
Total	27	100%	27	101%	37	99%	30	100%

*Total does not equal 100% because individual percentages were rounded off to the nearest whole number.

TABLE B21

NUMBER OF SOCIAL SERVICE UNITS FOR WHICH AN
APPEAL TO THE COUNTY BOARD OF ASSISTANCE HAS OCCURRED
BETWEEN SEPTEMBER, 1974 - AUGUST, 1975

Occurrence Of Appeal	Dual Response				Total Responses			
	Supervisor		Service Worker		Supervisor		Service Worker	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Yes	4	15%	4	15%	9	24%	5	17%
No	22	81%	22	81%	27	73%	22	73%
Blank	1	4%	1	4%	1	3%	3	10%
Total	27	100%	27	100%	37	100%	30	100%

B-18

TABLE B22

REPORTED NUMBER OF APPEALS WHICH HAVE BEEN MADE
PER UNIT BETWEEN SEPTEMBER, 1974 AND AUGUST, 1975

Number of Appeals Made September, 1975-August, 1975	Dual Response N=8		Total Response N=13	
	Supervisor	Service Worker	Supervisor	Service Worker
	Number	Number	Number	Number
1	0	3	0	4
2	0	0	2	0
3	2	0	2	0
4	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0
6	0	1	1	1
7	0	0	1	0
Blank	2	0	2	0

TABLE B23

NUMBER OF SOCIAL SERVICE UNITS IN WHICH THE SOCIAL SERVICE WORKER HAS THE AUTHORITY TO GRANT ADMISSION OF A CHILD INTO THE DAY CARE PROGRAM

Worker Has Authority	Dual Response **				Total Response			
	Supervisor		Service Worker		Supervisor		Service Worker	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage*
Yes	19	70%	14	52%	25	68%	16	53%
No	8	30%	12	44%	12	32%	13	43%
Not Applicable	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	1	3%
Total	27	100%	27	100%	37	100%	30	99%

*Total does not equal 100% because individual percentages were rounded off to the nearest whole number.

**Dual Responses to this item were not in agreement for 7 of 27 pairs (26%).

B-20

TABLE B24

THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE SERVICE WORKER WITH AUTHORITY TO GRANT ADMISSION OF A CHILD INTO THE DAY CARE PROGRAM CONSULTS WITH OTHER PERSONS FIRST

Other Persons Are Consulted First	Dual Response		Total Response	
	Supervisor N-19	Service Worker N=14	Supervisor N=25	Service Worker N=17
	Number	Number	Number	Number
Yes	17	11	22	12
No	1	3	2	4
Not Applicable	1	0	1	1

TABLE B25

OTHER PERSONS CONSULTED BY SERVICE WORKER PRIOR TO GRANTING ADMISSION OF CHILD INTO DAY CARE PROGRAM

Other Person Consulted	Dual Response		Total Response	
	Supervisor N=23	Service Worker N=13	Supervisor N=30	Service Worker N=15
	Number	Number	Number	Number
Director (agency/ center/program)	11	6	15	6
Head Teacher	6	4	7	5
Social Services Supervisor	2	0	3	0
Psychologist or Other Specialist	1	0	1	0
Caregiver	3	3	4	4

TABLE B26

POSITIONS OF PERSONS WHO PARTICIPATE IN THE DECISION TO ADMIT A CHILD INTO THE DAY CARE PROGRAM WHERE SERVICE WORKERS DO NOT HAVE THAT AUTHORITY

Positions of Persons**	Dual Response		Total Response	
	Supervisor N=8	Service Worker N=12	Supervisor N=12	Service Worker N=13
	Number	Number	Number	Number
Director	7	10	10	10
Head Teacher	4	3	4	4
Social Service Supervisor	7	9	8	9
Psychologist or Other Specialist	4	4	4	4
Admission Committee	0	4	0	4
Consultants	0	1	0	2
Others	1	0	1	0

**Multiple responses were accepted.

TABLE B27

EXTENT TO WHICH SERVICE WORKERS HAVE THE AUTHORITY
TO REMOVE A CHILD FROM THE DAY CARE PROGRAM

Social Service Worker Has The Authority To Remove Child	Dual Response **				Total Responses			
	Supervisor		Service Worker		Supervisor		Service Worker	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage*	Number	Percentage*
Yes	4	15%	3	11%	5	14%	5	17%
No	21	78%	23	85%	27	73%	23	77%
Conditional	2	7%	1	4%	5	14%	1	3%
Do Not Know	0	0	0	0	0	0%	1	3%
Total	27	100%	27	100%	37	101%	30	100%

*Percentages were rounded off to nearest whole number and may not total 100%.
**Dual Responses to the item were not in agreement for 14 of 27 pairs (52%).

116

TABLE B28

POSITIONS OF PERSONS WHO ARE INVOLVED IN A DECISION TO REMOVE A CHILD FROM THE DAY CARE PROGRAM

Positions of Persons**	Dual Response				Total Response			
	Supervisor N=21		Service Worker N=23		Supervisor N=27		Service Worker N=23	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Admission Committee	1	5%	1	4%	1	4%	1	4%
Psychologist or Other Specialist	3	14%	1	4%	3	11%	1	4%
Director	17	81%	19	83%	22	81%	19	83%
Service Worker or Supervisor	14	67%	16	70%	18	67%	16	70%
Head Teacher	6	28%	8	35%	9	33%	8	35%
Entire Staff	2	10%	1	4%	2	7%	1	4%
Parent	2	10%	1	4%	2	7%	1	4%
Other Caregivers	1	5%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%
Unspecified	1	5%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%

**Multiple Responses were accepted. Fourteen of 27 supervisors indicated that the decision was made by a group of persons, 15 of the 27 service workers indicated this, and 4 of 10 "Total Response" Supervisors so indicated.

B-24

TABLE B29

AGENCIES' CRITERIA FOR REMOVING A CHILD FROM THE DAY CARE PROGRAM

Conditions For Removal From Program**	Dual Response				Total Response			
	Supervisor N=27		Service Worker N=27		Supervisor N=37		Service Worker N=30	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Excess Absences	17	63%	17	63%	23	62%	20	67%
Severe Disablement or Chronic Illness	13	48%	7	26%	15	40%	7	23%
Too Distant from Center	2	7%	3	11%	5	14%	3	10%
Disruptive Child	5	18%	6	22%	5	14%	6	20%
Transfer to other Center or School	4	15%	1	4%	5	14%	2	7%
Lack of Parent Co-operation with Policy (hours)	1	4%	2	7%	3	8%	2	7%
Lack of Parent Co-operation in Program or Disruptive Parent	7	26%	6	22%	10	27%	6	20%
Tardiness	3	11%	1	4%	6	16%	1	3%
Other: (hrs., teen parent)	4	15%	4	15%	5	14%	5	17%
None	1	4%	1	4%	2	5%	1	3%

**Multiple Responses were accepted.

TABLE B30

CRITERIA FOR REMOVING A CHILD FROM
THE DAY CARE PROGRAM FOR WORKERS WITH CONDITIONAL
AUTHORITY TO TERMINATE SERVICES

Types of Conditions**	Total Response N=6
Excess Absences	4
Severe Disablement or Chronic Illness	0
Too distant from Center	0
Disruptive Child	1
Transfer to other Center or School	0
Lack of Parent Cooperation with Policy	4
Lack of Parent Cooperation in Program or Discruptive Parent	1
Tardiness	1
Unspecified	2

**Multiple Responses were accepted.

TABLE B31

POSITIONS OF PERSONS WHO DECIDE DATE
ON WHICH CHILD BEGINS TO ATTEND PROGRAM

Positions Of Persons**	Dual Response***				Total Response			
	Supervisor N=27		Service Worker N=27		Supervisor N=37		Service Worker N=30	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Service Worker	22	81%	19	70%	27	73%	20	67%
Teachers	10	37%	9	33%	15	40%	12	40%
Social Services Supervisor	3	11%	2	7%	4	11%	2	7%
Director (agency/ center/program)	9	33%	8	30%	14	38%	8	27%
Parent	4	15%	7	26%	6	16%	7	23%
All Staff (unspecified)	1	4%	0	0%	3	8%	0	0%
Blank	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%

**Multiple Responses were accepted.
***Dual Responses did not agree in 18 of 27 pairs (67%).

B-27

TABLE B32

POSITIONS OF PERSONS WHO DECIDE THE CARE GROUP IN WHICH THE CHILD WILL BE PLACED

Positions Of Persons**	Dual Response				Total Response			
	Supervisor N=27		Service Worker N=27		Supervisor N=37		Service Worker N=30	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Service Worker	17	63%	18	67%	21	57%	18	60%
Teacher	13	48%	12	44%	18	49%	14	47%
Social Services Supervisor	3	11%	3	11%	3	8%	3	10%
Director (agency/ center/program)	12	44%	9	33%	15	40%	9	30%
Parent	1	4%	0	0%	1	3%	1	3%
Staff (unspecified)	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%
None (Policy)	3	11%	2	7%	3	8%	2	7%
Blank	0	0%	0	0%	2	5%	1	3%

**Multiple Responses were accepted.
***Dual Responses did not agree for 11 of the 27 pairs (41%).

B-28

TABLE B33

POSITIONS OF PERSONS WHO ESTABLISH
CHILD'S STARTING TIME IN PROGRAM

Positions Of Persons**	Dual Response***				Total Response			
	Supervisor N=27		Service Worker N=27		Supervisor N=37		Service Worker N=30	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Service Worker	13	48%	14	52%	17	46%	14	47%
Teacher	4	15%	1	4%	8	22%	2	7%
Social Services Supervisor	2	7%	0	0%	2	5%	0	0%
Director (agency/ center/program)	7	26%	5	18%	11	30%	5	17%
Parent	6	22%	12	44%	8	22%	12	40%
Staff (unspecified)	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%
No One (Policy)	7	26%	4	15%	9	24%	5	17%
Blank	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%

**Multiple Response were accepted. Supervisors noted combination in 15 cases, while Service Workers noted combinations in 10 cases.
***Dual Responses did not agree in 19 of 27 pairs (70%).

B-29

TABLE B34

THE NUMBER OF SOCIAL SERVICE UNITS
REPORTING PROMOTION OF STAFF BETWEEN
SEPTEMBER, 1974 AND AUGUST, 1975

Promotion Has Occurred 9/74 - 8/75	Dual Response				Total Responses			
	Supervisor		Service Worker		Supervisor		Service Worker	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Social Worker:								
Yes	2	7%	3	11%	4	11%	3	10%
No	8	30%	11	41%	13	35%	13	43%
Not Applicable	16	59%	13	48%	19	51%	14	47%
Blank	1	4%	0	0	1	3%	0	0%
Total	27	100%	27	100%	37	100%	30	100%
Assistant/Aide:								
Yes	5	19%	6	22%	6	16%	6	20%
No	22	81%	21	78%	30	81%	23	77%
Not Applicable	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	1	3%
Blank	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	27	100%	27	100%	37	100%	30	100%

*Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number and total may not equal 100%.

TABLE B35

ORIENTATION PROVIDED FOR NEW
SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS BY THEIR AGENCY

	Dual Response				Total Responses			
	Supervisor		Service Worker		Supervisor		Service Worker	
Orientation Was Provided	Number	Percentage*	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Yes	19	70%	20	74%	26	70%	22	73%
Sometimes	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	1	3%
No	2	7%	2	7%	2	5%	2	7%
Not Applicable	6	22%	4	15%	8	22%	5	17%
Blank	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%
Total	27	99%	27	100%	37	100%	30	100%

*Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number and may not total 100%

TABLE B36

THE NUMBER OF SOCIAL SERVICE UNITS FOR
WHICH STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND/OR TRAINING IS PROVIDED
BY THE DAY CARE AGENCY

Social Service Staff Training And/Or Development Provided By Agency	Dual Response**				Total Responses			
	Supervisor		Service Worker		Supervisor		Service Worker	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Yes	14	52%	17	63%	19	51%	17	57%
No	13	48%	10	37%	18	49%	13	43%
Total	27	100%	27	100%	37	100%	30	100%

**Dual responses did not agree for 12 of the 27 pairs (44%).

B-32

TABLE B37

TOPICS OF AGENCY TRAINING AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Topic of Training and Staff Development**	Dual Response		Total Response	
	Supervisor N=14	Service Worker N=17	Supervisor N=18	Service Worker N=18
	Number	Number	Number	Number
Assessment Skills	1	2	1	2
Child Development	2	5	2	5
Communication Skills	2	4	3	4
Discussion on Special Topics	8	5	11	5
Form Procedure	1	3	1	3
Health Care and Screening	4	2	5	2
Life Skills	0	1	0	1
Sensitivity/ Awareness	0	0	0	0
Supervision/ Management	0	0	0	0
Interaction Techniques	0	0	0	0
Counseling Techniques	0	0	0	1
Therapy Techniques	0	1	0	1
"Working with Parent" Techniques	8	6	10	6
Other (External Programs Identified)	6	6	8	7

**Multiple responses were accepted.

TABLE B38

NUMBER OF SOCIAL SERVICE UNITS WHOSE STAFF WAS INVOLVED IN EXTERNAL TRAINING PROGRAMS

Social Service Workers of Unit are Involved	Dual Response **				Total Response			
	Supervisor		Service Worker		Supervisor		Service Worker	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage*	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Yes	21	78%	15	60%	26	70%	19	69%
No	6	22%	11	41%	11	30%	11	37%
Total	27	100%	27	101%	37	100%	30	100%

*Since percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number, totals may not equal 100%.

**Dual Responses did not agree for 5 of 27 pairs (19%).

B-34

TABLE B39

AGENCIES PROVIDING EXTERNAL TRAINING
FOR SOCIAL SERVICE STAFF

Providing Agency**	Dual Response		Total Response	
	Supervisor N=21	Service Worker N=16	Supervisor N=26	Service Worker N=19
	Number	Number	Number	Number
Day Care Services	17	16	20	19
Deparement of Public Welfare and/or County Board of Assistant	2	0	2	0
4'C Council	3	1	3	2
Health Advocacy Training Program	2	1	3	1
University or College	3	2	4	2
Professional Organization Conferences	10	7	10	7
Other Day Care Agencies	6	5	6	5

**Multiple responses were accepted.

TABLE B40

TOPICS OF EXTERNAL TRAINING PROGRAMS

Topic of Training**	Dual Response		Total Response	
	Supervisor N=21	Service Worker N=16	Supervisor N=26	Service Worker N=19
	Number	Number	Number	Number
Assessment	0	1	0	1
Child Development	0	0	0	0
Communication Skills	0	0	0	0
Discussion on Special Topics	3	1	3	1
Forms Procedure	4	1	4	2
Health Care and Screening	1	1	2	1
Life Skills	0	0	0	0
Sensitivity/ Awareness	0	2	0	2
Supervision/ Management	0	0	0	0
Intervention Techniques	0	0	0	0
Counseling Techniques	0	0	0	0
"Working with Parent" Techniques	3	2	4	2
Therapy Techniques	3	4	3	4
Support Group	3	4	6	7
Courses at University	4	3	4	3
Other (meetings, conferences, and workshops unspecified)	10	11	10	11

**Multiple responses were accepted.

TABLE B41

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH OF SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS
PROVIDED BY MEANS OTHER THAN WORKSHOPS AND COURSES

Means of Professional Growth**	Dual Response				Total Response			
	Supervisor N=27		Service Worker N=27		Supervisor N=37		Service Worker N=30	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Journals and other Professional Literature	8	30%	3	11%	8	22%	3	10%
Library	2	7%	4	15%	2	5%	4	13%
Consultants	2	7%	5	19%	3	8%	5	17%
Case Conferences (individual or group)	3	11%	1	4%	4	11%	2	7%
Conferences on Special Subjects	2	7%	1	4%	2	5%	1	3%
Other	5	19%	1	4%	8	22%	1	3%
Blank	7	26%	16	59%	10	27%	18	60%

**Multiple repponses were accepted.

B-37

TABLE B42

WAYS IN WHICH AGENCY SUPPORTS STAFF PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

Type of Support**	Dual Response				Total Response			
	Supervisor N=27		Service Worker N=27		Supervisor N=37		Service Worker N=30	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Release time with pay	22	81%	19	70%	29	78%	21	70%
Release time without pay	8	30%	6	22%	12	32%	6	20%
Stipend (books, course, tuition)	5	19%	2	7%	6	16%	2	7%
Partial payment	21	78%	15	56%	24	65%	16	53%
Conference Fees	3	11%	1	4%	4	11%	1	3%
Other (travel paid, time allowed to be made up)	1	4%	0	0%	2	5%	0	0%

**Multiple responses were accepted.

A-38

TABLE B43

ESTIMATED NUMBER OF FAMILIES ASSIGNED TO
SOCIAL WORKERS AND ASSISTANTS/AIDES

	Dual Response				Total Responses			
	Supervisor		Service Worker		Supervisor		Service Worker	
Number Of Families	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage*
Social Worker								
20 or less	5	19%	3	11%	5	14%	3	10%
21-30	3	11%	5	19%	4	11%	6	20%
31-40	6	22%	7	26%	9	24%	8	27%
41-50	2	7%	3	11%	3	8%	3	10%
51-60	2	7%	2	7%	2	5%	3	10%
61-70	2	7%	0	0%	2	5%	0	0%
71-80	1	4%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%
81-90	1	4%	0	0%	2	5%	0	0%
91-100	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
100 Plus	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
No Caseload	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%
NA (No Social Worker)	1	4%	2	7%	4	11%	2	7%
Unspecified	4	15%	5	19%	4	11%	5	17%
Total	27	100%	27	100%	37	100%	30	101%
Assistant/Aides								
20 or less	3	11%	1	4%	3	8%	1	3%
21-30	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%
31-40	1	4%	3	11%	3	8%	3	10%
41-50	0	0%	1	4%	1	3%	1	3%
51-60	0	0%	3	11%	0	0%	3	10%
61-70	2	7%	0	0%	2	5%	1	3%
71-80	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
81-90	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
91-100	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
100 Plus	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
No Caseload	0	0%	1	4%	1	3%	2	7%
NA (No assistant/aide)	17	63%	15	55%	22	59%	16	53%
Unspecified	4	15%	3	11%	4	11%	3	10%
Total	27	100%	27	100%	37	100%	30	99%

*Total does not equal 100% because individual percentages have been rounded off to the nearest whole number.

TABLE B44

TOTAL NUMBERS OF FAMILIES ESTIMATED FOR THE SOCIAL SERVICE UNIT BY RESPONDENT

Number Of Families	Dual Response				Total Responses			
	Supervisor		Service Worker		Supervisor		Service Worker	
	Number	Percentage*	Number	Percentage*	Number	Percentage*	Number	Percentage
Less than 20	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
21-30	1	4%	0	0%	3	8%	1	3%
31-40	5	18%	4	15%	8	22%	5	17%
41-50	4	15%	6	22%	6	16%	6	20%
51-60	4	15%	4	15%	4	11%	5	17%
61-70	3	11%	3	11%	3	8%	3	10%
71-80	1	4%	1	4%	1	3%	1	3%
81-90	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%
91-100	1	4%	1	4%	1	3%	1	3%
101 Plus	4	15%	5	19%	6	16%	5	17%
Unspecified	4	15%	3	11%	4	11%	3	10%
Total	27	1101%	27	101%	37	101%	30	100%

*Total does not equal 100% because individual percentages have been rounded off to the nearest whole number

B-40

TABLE B45

ESTIMATED PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES PER SOCIAL SERVICE UNIT
IN NEED OF OR REQUESTING SERVICES BEYOND DAY CARE PLACEMENT

Percentage Ranges: Estimated Families	Dual Response**				Total Responses			
	Supervisor		Service Worker		Supervisor		Service Worker	
	Number	Percentage*	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage*	Number	Percentage*
0-9	0	0%	1	4%	1	3%	2	7%
10-19	3	11%	1	4%	3	8%	1	3%
20-29	1	4%	4	15%	3	8%	5	17%
30-39	5	19%	5	19%	6	16%	5	17%
40-49	1	4%	1	4%	2	5%	1	3%
50-59	2	7%	1	4%	3	8%	1	3%
60-69	3	11%	2	7%	3	8%	2	7%
70-79	1	4%	2	7%	2	5%	3	10%
80-89	1	4%	2	7%	1	3%	2	7%
90-99	0	0%	4	15%	0	0%	4	13%
100	8	30%	2	7%	11	30%	2	7%
Blank	2	7%	2	7%	2	5%	2	7%
Total	27	101%	27	100%	37	99%	30	101%

*Total does not equal 100% because individual percentages have been rounded off to the nearest whole number.

**Matched pairs did not agree in 15 (56%) of 27 pairs.

TABLE B46

NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO REPORTED
THE DEVELOPMENT OF A SERVICE PLAN
FOR FAMILIES REQUESTING OR IN NEED OF SERVICES
BEYOND DAY CARE PLACEMENT

A Service Plan Is Developed by Social Service Workers	Dual Response**				Total Responses			
	Supervisor		Service Worker		Supervisor		Service Worker	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage*	Number	Percentage
Yes	20	74%	20	74%	25	68%	22	73%
No	6	22%	7	26%	11	30%	8	27%
Blank	1	4%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%
Total	27	100%	27	100%	37	101%	30	100%

*Total does not equal 100% because individual percentages have been rounded off to the nearest whole number.

**Dual Responses did not agree for 7 of 27 pairs (26%).

B-42

TABLE B47

MODE IN WHICH SERVICE PLAN
IS DEVELOPED BY SOCIAL SERVICE WORKER
IN THOSE UNITS WHICH DEVELOPED SERVICE PLANS

Mode In Which Service Plan Is Developed	Dual Response**				Total Responses			
	Supervisor		Service Worker		Supervisor		Service Workers	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Written Only	6	30%	3	15%	7	28%	3	14%
Oral Only	7	35%	10	50%	8	32%	11	50%
Written and Oral	7	35%	5	25%	10	40%	6	27%
Blank	0	0%	2	10%	0	0%	2	9%
Total	20	100%	20	100%	25	100%	22	100%

*Total does not equal 100% because individual percentages have been rounded off to the nearest whole number.

**Dual Responses did not agree for 9 of 16 pairs (56%).

B-43

TABLE B48

NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS IDENTIFYING "FOUR STEP" PROCEDURE IN DEVELOPING A SERVICE PLAN

Development of Plan: 1. Analysis of problem 2. Identification of critical factors 3. Alternatives for action 4. Decision to specific approach	Dual Response **				Total Responses			
	Supervisor		Service Worker		Supervisor		Service Worker	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage*
All "Steps" identified by respondents	2	10%	5	25%	3	12%	5	23%
All "Steps" not identified by respondents	17	85%	14	70%	21	84%	16	73%
No Response	1	5%	1	5%	1	4%	1	5%
Total	20	100%	20	100%	25	100%	22	101%

**Dual Responses did not agree in 16 of 16 pairs (100%). Responses in the table are based only on those who reported that their unit developed a service plan.

*Total percentage does not equal 100% because individual percentages were rounded off to the nearest whole number.

B-44

TABLE B49

PERSONS WHO ARE INVOLVED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SERVICE PLAN

Persons Involved	Dual Response **				Total Response			
	Supervisor		Service Worker		Supervisor		Service Worker	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Professional Staff Only	9	45%	8	40%	9	36%	8	36%
Parents and Social Service Worker	4	20%	5	25%	5	20%	6	27%
Parents, Social Service Worker, and other Staff	5	25%	4	20%	7	28%	5	23%
Parents	1	5%	2	10%	2	8%	2	9%
Other (Director, group process)	1	5%	1	5%	2	8%	1	5%
Total	20	100%	20	100%	25	100%	22	100%

**Dual Responses did not agree for 8 of 16 pairs (50%).
This table lists only those reported that their unit developed a service plan.

TABLE B50

SUBSEQUENT USE OF SERVICE PLAN AFTER ITS DEVELOPMENT

Persons Who Use Service Plan**	Dual Response ***				Total Response			
	Supervisor N=20		Service Worker N=20		Supervisor N=25		Service Worker N=22	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Plan is discussed with Parent	18	90%	19	95%	22	88%	21	95%
Plan is given to Parent	5	25%	1	5%	5	20%	2	9%
Plan is Used by Social Worker Only	5	25%	8	40%	6	27%	8	36%
Plan is Used by Social Workers and Staff	14	70%	18	90%	18	72%	20	91%
Other	1	5%	1	5%	1	4%	1	5%

**Multiple responses were accepted.

***Dual Responses did not agree for 7 of 16 pairs (44%). The data in this table is based only on those who responded that their Unit developed Service Plans.

TABLE B51

THE EXTENT TO WHICH AGENCIES WERE REPORTED TO HAVE
A CENTRAL COMMUNITY RESOURCE FILE

There Is A Central Community Resource File For The Agency	Dual Response **				Total Response			
	Supervisor		Service Worker		Supervisor		Service Worker	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Yes	24	89%	21	78%	33	89%	22	73%
No	3	11%	6	22%	4	11%	8	27%
Total	27	100%	27	100%	37	100%	30	100%

**Dual Responses did not agree for 16 of 27 pairs (59%).

TABLE B52

PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR MAINTAINING AND
UPDTATING COMMUNITY RESOURCE FILE

Persons Responsible For Community Resource File	Dual Response **				Total Responses			
	Supervisor		Service Worker		Supervisor		Service Worker	
	Number	Percentage*	Number	Percentage*	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage*
Social Worker	6	22%	3	11%	11	30%	5	17%
Supervisor/Director	9	33%	12	44%		24%	13	43%
Social Worker and Director	4	15%	2	7%	5	14%	2	7%
All Staff	2	7%	0	0%	2	5%	0	0%
Other	3	11%	2	7%	6	16%	2	7%
Blank	3	11%	8	30%	4	11%	8	27%
Total	27	99%	27	99%	37	100%	30	101%

*Total does not equal 100% because individual percentages were rounded off to the nearest whole number.

**Dual Responses did not agree for 11 of 27 pairs (41%).

TABLE B53

A CONSISTENT METHOD HAS BEEN DEVELOPED TO UPDATE COMMUNITY AGENCIES OF THE AGENCY'S PROGRAM AND SERVICES

A Consistent Method Has Been Developed	Dual Response**				Total Responses			
	Supervisor		Service Worker		Supervisor		Service Worker	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage*
Yes	14	52%	15	56%	17	46%	16	53%
No	11	41%	9	33%	18	49%	11	36%
Blank	2	7%	3	11%	2	5%	3	10%
Total	27	100%	27	100%	37	100%	30	99%

*Total does not equal 100% because individual percentages were rounded off to the nearest whole number.

**Dual Responses did not agree for 9 of 27 pairs (33%).

TABLE B54

THE FREQUENCY IN WHICH COMMUNITY AGENCIES ARE UPDATED OF AGENCY'S SERVICES

Frequency of Updating Community Agencies	Dual Response**		Total Response	
	Supervisor N=14	Service Worker N=15	Supervisor N=17	Service Worker N=16
	Number	Number	Number	Number
Weekly	2	1	3	1
Monthly	0	2	0	2
Quarterly	0	3	0	4
Annually	2	2	3	2
Bi-annually	5	2	5	2
Periodically	2	5	2	5
Blank	3	0	4	0

TABLE B55

TYPE OF REFERRALS MADE MOST FREQUENTLY
TO COMMUNITY AGENCIES THROUGH THE SOCIAL SERVICE
COMPONENT AND THE NUMBER OF TIMES EACH TYPE
OF COMMUNITY AGENCY'S WAS IDENTIFIED

Types of Referrals Identified by the 67 Respondents	Dual Response				Total Response			
	Supervisor		Service Worker		Supervisor		Service Worker	
	Number	Percentage*	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage*	Number	Percentage*
Day Care Placement	5	3%	6	4%	9	4%	8	5%
Employment/ Training	6	4%	7	5%	7	3%	8	5%
Family Counseling	12	8%	13	9%	18	9%	13	8%
Family Planning	1	1%	2	1%	1	1%	2	1%
Food Stamp/Medical or Public Assistance	15	10%	14	9%	18	9%	14	9%
Health Care	76	50%	71	47%	108	54%	73	46%
Housing	5	3%	5	3%	5	2%	5	3%
Legal	2	1%	1	1%	4	2%	2	1%
Marital/Divorce/ Separation	2	1%	2	1%	2	1%	2	1%
School Placement	11	7%	10	7%	11	5%	10	6%
School Related Needs	2	1%	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%
Transportation	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%	2	1%
Other	15	10%	18	12%	16	8%	18	11%
Total	152	99%	152	100%	201	99%	158	97%

TABLE B56

A WRITTEN POLICY ESTABLISHING THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF CONTACTS WITH ELIGIBLE FAMILIES HAS BEEN DEVELOPED

A Written Policy Has Been Developed	Dual Response**				Total Responses			
	Supervisor		Service Worker		Supervisor		Service Worker	
	Number	Percentage*	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage*	Number	Percentage
Yes	13	48%	11	41%	15	41%	11	37%
No	13	48%	16	59%	21	57%	19	63%
Blank	1	1%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%
Total	27	97%	27	100%	37	101%	30	100%

*Total does not equal 100% because individual percentages were rounded off to the nearest whole number.

**Dual Responses did not agree for 8 of 27 pairs (30%).

B-52

TABLE B57

FREQUENCY OF MINIMUM NUMBER
OF CONTACTS ESTABLISHED BY AGENCIES

Minimum Number of Contacts	Dual Response		Total Response	
	Supervisor N=13	Service Worker N=11	Supervisor N=15	Service Worker N=11
	Number	Number	Number	Number
Monthly	5	6	6	6
Once A Year	1	1	1	2
Twice A Year	4	3	4	3
Three or More Times A Year	1	1	1	1
Don't Know	2	0	3	0

TABLE B58

TYPE OF DISCUSSION UNDERTAKEN
DURING THE REQUIRED MINIMUM
CONTACTS ESTABLISHED BY THE AGENCIES

	Dual Response		Total Response	
	Supervisor N=13	Service Worker N=11	Supervisor N=15	Service Worker N=11
Type of Discussion **	Number	Number	Number	Number
Child Evaluation or Progress	10	8	12	8
Family or Child Management Problems	2	2	3	4
Assessing Home Environment	5	7	7	7
Review of Agency's Policies	3	3	4	3
Eligibility	1	1	1	1
Parent Involvement Activities	0	1	0	1
Employment	0	1	0	1
School Placement	2	0	2	0
Unspecified	1	1	1	1

**Multiple responses were accepted from the respondents.

TABLE B59

THE GENERAL PATTERN OF ACTION
TAKEN BY A SOCIAL SERVICE WORKER TOWARD A FAMILY
WHICH FAILS TO ACT UPON AN AGENCY'S REFERRAL

Type Of Action**	Dual Response***										Total Response									
	Supervisor N=23					Service Worker N=21					Supervisor N=32					Service Worker N=23				
	Order of Rank					Order of Rank					Order of Rank					Order of Rank				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Call in family and discuss the situation	17	3	3	0	0	12	3	1	0	0	22	4	3	0	0	14	3	1	0	0
Re-arrange a second appointment for the family	7	12	2	0	0	3	8	4	0	0	10	16	3	0	0	3	9	5	0	0
Take the family to the referred Agency	1	2	7	5	0	2	1	7	4	0	1	3	13	6	0	2	1	4	8	0
Worker makes a home visit	7	8	2	0	0	3	5	2	0	0	12	10	2	1	0	3	6	2	1	0
No action - family must take their own initiative	0	2	2	2	0	1	2	0	2	0	0	2	3	3	2	1	2	0	2	1
Other	1	2	2	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	2	0	1	0	0

**Responses with same rank were accepted

***Dual Responses did not agree for 16 of 27 pairs (59%) for Rank 1.
Dual responses did not agree for 20 of 27 pairs (74%) for Rank 2.
Dual responses did not agree for 18 of 27 pairs (67%) for Rank 3.
Dual responses did not agree for 8 of 27 pairs (30%) for Rank 4.

TABLE B60

FOLLOW UP SERVICES ARE PROVIDED
TO FAMILIES WHO ARE TERMINATED
FROM THE DAY CARE PROGRAM

Follow Up Services Are Provided	Dual Response**				Total Response			
	Supervisor		Service Worker		Supervisor		Service Worker	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Yes	18	67%	17	63%	23	62%	18	60%
No	9	33%	10	27%	14	38%	12	40%
Total	27	100%	27	100%	37	100%	30	100%

**Dual Response did not agree for 20 of 27 pairs (74%).

B-56

TABLE B61

TYPES OF FOLLOW UP SERVICES
PROVIDED BY SOCIAL SERVICE STAFF
TO FAMILIES TERMINATED FROM THE
DAY CARE PROGRAM

Types of Follow Up Services	Dual Response		Total Response	
	Supervisor N=18	Service Worker N=17	Supervisor N=23	Service Worker N=18
	Number	Number	Number	Number
Referral-Counseling Services (unspecified)	6	8	8	8
Physical or Mental Health Services	4	5	7	5
Home Visits (unspecified)	5	4	6	5
Phone Contacts (unspecified)	3	3	4	4
School Visits	3	3	4	4
Placement (Day Care or School)	2	5	2	5
Testing or Evaluation Services	1	2	1	2
Other (fund raising, conferences)	4	1	5	6

TABLE B62

THE NUMBER OF SOCIAL WORKERS
WHO HAVE A ROLE IN THE PARENT
PARTICIPATION ACTIVITIES OF THE AGENCY

Social Workers Participate In The Parent Activities	Dual Response**				Total Responses			
	Supervisor		Service Worker		Supervisor		Service Worker	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Yes	24	89%	26	96%	33	89%	29	97%
No	3	11%	1	4%	4	11%	1	3%
Total	27	100%	27	100%	37	100%	30	100%

**Dual Responses did not agree for 2 of 27 pairs (7%).

B-58

TABLE B63

TYPE OF RESPONSIBILITY UNDERTAKEN
BY THE SOCIAL SERVICE WORKER IN
PARENT PARTICIPATION ACTIVITIES

Types of Responsibilities	Dual Response				Total Responses			
	Supervisor N=24		Service Worker N=26		Supervisor N = 33		Service Worker N = 29	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Initial Contact to Describe how Parents are Involved in Parent Participation Activities	23	96%	26	100%	32	97%	29	100%
Contacting or Notifying Parents of Activities	22	92%	26	100%	31	94%	29	100%
Recruiting Parents Into Taking an Active Role in Parent Activities	22	92%	25	96%	31	94%	27	93%
Sustaining Parent's Interest in Parent Activities	20	83%	24	92%	29	88%	27	93%
Supervising Parent Activities	16	67%	15	58%	21	64%	16	55%
Others: organize activities, availability for activities, attending meetings	4	17%	4	15%	6	18%	4	14%

TABLE B64

PRIMARY AGENCY SOCIAL SERVICES
IDENTIFIED BY SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS

Types of Services Identified	Dual Response				Total Response			
	Supervisor N=27		Service Worker N=27		Supervisor N=37		Service Worker N=30	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Counseling	16	59%	17	63%	20	54%	19	63%
Information and Referral	13	48%	18	67%	17	45%	21	70%
Support Services (role as advocate, availability)	10	37%	3	11%	15	40	4	13%
Liaison between Agency and Family	9	33%	2	7%	10	27%	2	6%
Health Services	3	11%	7	26%	3	8%	7	23%
Parent Training & Parent Activities	3	11%	7	26%	5	13%	7	23%
Liaison among Agency, Community Agencies, and Family	3	11%	4	15%	4	10%	4	13%
Therapy	2	7%	2	7%	2	5%	2	6%
Interpretor of Policies	1	4%	0	0%	3	8%	0	0%
Transportation	1	4%	2	7%	1	2%	2	6%
Finding Employment	1	4%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%
School Placement	1	4%	1	4%	1	2%	1	3%
Professional Skills held by Worker	3	11%	4	15%	3	8%	4	13%
Other: (food, baby-sitting)	5	19%	8	30%	9	24%	9	30%

B-60

TABLE B65

COMMON FAMILY PROBLEM AREAS IDENTIFIED
BY SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS

Problem Areas Identified By Social Service Worker	Dual Response				Total Response			
	Supervisor N-27		Service Worker N=27		Supervisor N=37		Service Worker N=30	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Alcoholism & Drugs	3	11%	4	15%	4	11%	4	13%
Child's Academic Problems	3	11%	5	19%	3	8%	6	20%
Child Rearing or Child Guidance	13	48%	17	63%	16	43%	17	57%
Employment/Training	7	26%	6	22%	10	27%	8	27%
Family or Home Management	10	37%	9	33%	13	35%	9	30%
Fuel/Food/Clothing/ Money	4	15%	9	33%	6	16%	12	40%
Gang/Crime	3	11%	5	19%	3	8%	5	17%
Housing/Landlord	8	30%	9	33%	14	38%	10	33%
Inter-relationship of family members	6	22%	5	19%	12	32%	5	17%
Marriage/Separation/ Divorce	11	41%	16	59%	12	32%	16	53%
Mental Health (self-esteem, guilt)	5	19%	9	33%	8	22%	10	33%
Physical Health (child abuse, personal hygiene)	14	52%	11	41%	20	54%	14	47%
School Placement	2	7%	4	15%	2	5%	5	17%
Transportation	3	11%	0	0%	4	11%	0	0%
Other (death, learning English)	10	37%	4	15%	12	32%	5	17%
Unspecified (Child Welfare	8	30%	2	7%	9	24%	3	10%

TABLE B66

PROBLEM AREAS IDENTIFIED BY SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS IN RELATION TO POLICIES AND OPERATIONS OF ONE'S AGENCY

Problem Areas Identified	Dual Response				Total Response			
	Supervisor N=21		Service Worker N=18		Supervisor N=29		Service Worker N=20	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Role Clarification	9	43%	9	44%	13	45%	10	50%
Increasing or Overwhelming Paper Work	4	15%	5	28%	5	17%	5	15%
Lack Support and Acceptance from Staff or Poor Communication with Staff	7	33%	10	56%	9	31%	10	50%
Difficulty Keeping Pace with Policies or Policy Changes	4	19%	4	22%	5	17%	4	20%
Philosophy - Disagreement about Values, Techniques or Expectations from Family	2	10%	4	[illegible]%	4	14%	4	20%
Viewed as Disciplinarian or Policy Enforcer	4	19%	0	0%	6	21%	1	5%
Alienation from Decision Makers	0	0%	2	11%	1	3%	3	15%
Personnel Policies (hrs., salary, who supervises)	3	14%	3	17%	4	14%	3	15%
Lack of Adequate Office Facilities and Supplies	1	5%	1	6%	2	7%	1	5%
Lack of Training Programs	2	10%	0	0%	2	7%	0	0%
Escort Arrangements or Room Coverage	2	10%	0	0%	2	7%	0	0%
Other (services fragmented, individual's needs)	0	0%	1	6%	2	7%	1	5%